LEVEL ONE

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

May, 1922 Vol. 11 No. 3

Editorial Comment - - - - - 691
A Momentous Experiment—Dr. Bernard on the Creed—Why Should They?—The Bishop of Durham on Anglicanism—On Going Too Far—The Tongues of the Clergy—A Suggestion for the Church Congress—World Conference on Faith and Order.

Church Unity and Credal Requirements - - 704
Charles Fiske

American Unitarianism - - - - - - - 716
Frederick Sherman Arnold

What Shall the Clergy Preach About? - - 721
A Layman

The Mystery Religions and Christianity - - 727
William Philip Downes

The Lord's Service for the Lord's Day - - 738
Hamilton Schuyler

Gnats, Camels and the Point of Perspective - - 745
The Censor

Rest Denied - - - - - - - - - 748
Tavish Hogge

Book Reviews - - - - - - - - 754

Books Received - - - - - - - - 761

LIBRARY FRANCISCAN SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY, BERKELEY

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

OXFORD

Prayer Books and Hymnals

Combination sets of the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER *and* THE NEW HYMNAL *printed on fine white and the famous Oxford India papers, in various sizes and styles of binding. Complete catalogue upon request.*

A Few Selected Styles

MINION 48mo.

Size, 3⅞x2⅝ inches

Nos.

01004 *Seal Grain Cloth,* blind cross, square corners, white edges (*black*) $1.50*

01013 *Imitation Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges 2.50

01030 *French Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges 3.00

"Oxford India Paper" Edition

01030x *French Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges $4.00

01031x *French Morocco,* limp, gilt cross in center, round corners, red under gold edges 4.25

01076x *Venetian Morocco,* limp, fine grain, round corners, red under gold edges (*black*) 4.50

BOURGEOIS 32mo.

Size, 5x3⅛ inches

01513 *Imitation Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges $3.65

01515 *Imitation Morocco,* limp, gilt cross in center, round corners, red under gold edges 3.65

01530 *French Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges 4.50

"Oxford India Paper" Edition

01530x *French Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges $5.75

01531x *French Morocco,* limp, gilt cross in center, round corners, red under gold edges 6.00

01536x *French Morocco,* limp, gilt monogram, round corners, red under gold edges, gilt roll 6.25

FOR ALTER AND PRAYER DESK

Size, 7⅝x4⅞ inches

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

Nos.

06621 *Red Venetian,* boards, gilt edges, gilt roll $4.75

06650 *Turkey Morocco,* boards, gilt roll, gilt edges 6.95

06651 As No. 06650, *in red* 7.40

THE NEW HYMNAL
(To Match Above)

0621 *Red Venetian,* boards, gilt edges, gilt roll $5.60

0650 *Turkey Morocco,* boards, gilt roll, gilt edges (*black*) 7.80

0651 *Turkey Morocco,* boards, gilt roll, gilt edges (*red*) 8.25

OXFORD ALTAR SERVICE

Paged according to the New Standard of 1892

Arranged with regard for the convenience of the Celebrant

Oxford Great Primer Quarto

(Size, 11½x7¾ inches)

Beautifully printed on Oxford fine white paper

Nos.

0148 *Black French Levant,* bevelled cover, round corners, gilt edges. $10.00

0149 *Red French Levant,* bevelled cover, round corners, gilt edges. 12.00

0150 *Black Persian Morocco,* bevelled cover, gilt edges 13.00

0155 *Red Persian Morocco,* bevelled cover, gilt edges 16.00

0160 *Black Turkey Morocco,* bevelled cover, gilt edges, gilt roll 25.00

0165 *Red Turkey Morocco,* bevelled cover, gilt edges, gilt roll 28.00

At all Booksellers or the Publishers

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS *American Branch*

35 WEST THIRTY-SECOND STREET NEW YORK

J. Whitehead & Sons Ltd

Artist Craftsmen, Sculptors.

For the ADORNMENT of the SACRED EDIFICE according to European tradition.

STONE, MARBLE, BRONZE.
BRASS, WROUGHT IRON &
THE PRECIOUS METALS.
WOODWORK & SCULPTURE.
Brochure "Church Decoration" free on application.

64, Bennington Oval London S.E.11

Established 1821. England.

THE GOOD NEWS

By Bernard Iddings Bell, D.D., President of St. Stephen's College, author of "Right and Wrong After the War." Cloth, $1.35. Postage about 10 cents.

The substance of this book grew out of the author's experiences when Chaplain at Great Lakes Naval Station during the War. The men, he said, scarcely had an idea what the Christian religion was about.

"The chapters of this book came into being in barracks talk. They were not made in one sitting. They grew. Later on, after the war was over, I gathered them together and wrote them down. I then used them in four 'parochial missions,' twice to ordinary parishes, in Lynn, Massachusetts, and Schenectady, New York, and twice to predominantly university congregations, at Ithaca and Princeton. They also became the basis of a series of instructions on personal religion at Wellesley Conference, a summer assembly of the Episcopal Church. There were seventy-four young women in my class there, about half of them of more advanced education and half of them working women of ordinary public school training. Everywhere these simple presentations of the fundamental things in Christianity seemed to arouse a considerable degree of interest. Therefore I am, after some hesitation, putting them into a book."

Published by

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

Rt. Rev. Charles Fiske, D.D., LL.D., is Bishop Coadjutor of Central New York.

Rev. Frederick Sherman Arnold, M.A., S.T.B., lives in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Rev. William Philip Downes is rector of Trinity Church, Bristol, Conn.

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler is rector of Trinity Church, Trenton, N. J.

The American Church Monthly

A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing with questions confronting the Anglican Communion and more especially the Church in the United States

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

1-3 Peace St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: George A. Armour, Princeton, N. J.
Vice-President: Hon. William J. Tully, Corning, N. Y.
Secretary: The Rev. Charles C. Edmunds, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York
Treasurer: Haley Fiske, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year — Twenty-five Cents a Copy
Canadian subscription, $3.25 a Year — Foreign subscription, $3.50 a Year

Vol. XI — May, 1922 — No. 3

EDITORIAL COMMENT

A Momentous Experiment

THE most interesting segment of Christendom today is that part which may conveniently be termed the Anglican communion. This embraces the Established Church in England and all the British possessions as well as the small but distinguished body fantastically called the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. We make bold to call this the most interesting part of Christendom today, not because of its peacefulness and harmony and perfect uniformity of practice,—we have none of these interesting and desirable qualities. There is probably no part of the Church in which fellow-Christians are so actively engaged in warfare with one another as the Anglican. No two parishes in the Anglican communion conduct their worship in exactly the same way. Neither is

it interesting because of its spiritual efficiency, its missionary zeal or its capacity for developing saints. It is most inefficient as a religious organization. Its lay folk take but scant interest in missionary enterprises and few of them seem ambitious to attain to the higher reaches of sanctity and mystical experience. Neither is it interesting because of its unworldliness; it is perhaps the most worldly Church in Christendom. In the eyes of many its chief characteristic is the extreme social respectability of its members. They form the *élite* of society. Neither is it interesting because of its strong appeal to the poor, or because of the preponderance of working people in its congregations. It makes almost no appeal to the poor, and the working classes, like the priest and the Levite, pass it by on the other side.

The Anglican Church is interesting rather because it is the scene of one of the most momentous religious experiments that is being carried on in our time anywhere in the world. The whole intricate problem of bringing together the scattered fragments of Christendom and welding them into one harmonious whole is being worked out among us as in a microcosm. Thus we can see on a small scale what the problem is and what are the hopes of its ultimate solution. All the factors that will have to be taken ultimately into consideration are exhibited somewhere among our discordant, inharmonious, hostile groups.

The question has often been raised by practical people whether a synthesis can ever be possible which will include Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Orthodox Eastern Christians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Seventh-Day Adventists, Plymouth Brethren, New Thoughters, and so forth. Are they not too hopelessly at variance with one another, and do they not present conceptions of religion that are too completely sundered for us ever to hope that they can be brought into one ecclesiastical body?

If anyone is distressed on this point he need only look at the Episcopal Church, for there we already have a living synthesis of all possible varieties of Christians. He will find living side by side and practicing their religion in the same parish, the most extreme Catholics and the most convinced Protestants; those who believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and those who only believe in His real absence; those who confess their sins to a priest and those who never confess their sins to anybody, not even

to God; those who believe they should go to mass every Sunday and those who maintain that there can be no such thing as a mass in a decent Christian church; those who ask the saints in Heaven for their prayers and those who hold that it is not possible for us mortals to have any communication whatever with the members of the Church triumphant.

We might take up in turn every conceivable Christian belief or practice and produce evidence that they are held or practiced somewhere in the Anglican communion. There can be no question about the fact. Church unity is possible. Protestants and Catholics and all the intermediate divisions of modernists and near-Catholics can live together and work together and worship together,—not always very amicably, to be sure, not in perfect peace and harmony,—but nevertheless in one religious body.

The real question is, can they continue to live together? Are they being drawn closer to one another in the bond of peace by the Spirit of God, or are they drifting further apart? Must there be a split in the near future between the Catholic and Protestant sections of the Anglican Church? These are extremely interesting questions, not simply because they concern the future of that small segment of Christendom which we call the Anglican communion, but because they concern the future of Christianity in the world. If Anglicans of all descriptions can live together and are becoming year by year more sympathetic and more appreciative of one another's position; if there are signs that they are gradually coalescing into an all-embracing unity which takes account of the elements of truth in every religious position; then there is certainly hope for the ultimate reunion of all Christian people.

What, as a matter of fact, is taking place? Are we too optimistic when we say that there seems to us to be a gradual leavening of the whole lump of Anglicanism with Catholic doctrine and practice? Take, for example, the frequency with which the Holy Eucharist is celebrated. A century ago it was extremely uncommon for the Lord's Service to be celebrated in any Anglican church oftener than three or four times a year; even a generation ago in this country it was most unusual to hear of its being celebrated oftener than once a month. Now there is almost no parish that does not offer its people a celebration of the Eucharist at least

once every Sunday. Or consider the gradual transformation of the Lord's Table into a beautiful Altar, elaborately ornamented and vested and covered with lights and flowers and surmounted by a cross or crucifix. This is a change which has taken place almost universally and it is always in a Catholic direction. If this sort of change continues with a similar rate of acceleration in all matters of faith and practice, we shall ultimately find the many varieties of Anglicans drawing closer together and approximating the norm of faith and practice which have always been associated with the Catholic religion.

In view of these facts what is the present duty of Anglo-Catholics? Are we to fight our brethren in every matter in which they do not see "eye to eye" with us? Are we to try to drive them out of the Church? Are we to insist in season and out of season that we alone are the rightful heirs of the Anglican tradition? This does not seem to us the right policy. We believe rather in the wisdom of the constructive policy of stating positively whenever we have the opportunity what is our faith and why we hold it,—"being always ready to give an answer to every man that asketh us a reason of the hope that is in us, with meekness and fear." We should throw our energy into making ourselves better Catholics in faith, in worship, in the use of the sacraments, in prayer, in our daily lives, rather than in attacking our brethren who differ from us. The Catholic Faith is the eternal truth of God and if it is given half a chance with people of good will it is bound to prevail. But we can never make it prevail by picayune and ill-spirited attacks upon our less fortunate brethren who through defects of training or environment have never seen the full glory of the faith and practice of the Catholic Church.

Dr. Bernard on the Creed

A CONSPICUOUS illustration of the loose way in which so many think and write has lately been furnished by a really able and good man, the Rt. Rev. J. H. Bernard, the retired Archbishop of Dublin. A series of lectures has been given in Manchester on some fundamental doctrines, and they have been printed in the *Church Times*. We have not been greatly impressed by

the course, which has been somewhat commonplace where it has not been unorthodox.

Dr. Bernard was the author of the one on the Creed, and we expected something better from one of his learning and piety. We find, however, a great deal of anxiety to propitiate the Modernists—who seem just now to be the *enfants terribles* of the Church of England—by minimizing the meaning of the articles of the Creed, and by conceding the possibility of a restating or rephrasing, which he nevertheless deprecates. Altogether, it is rather a timid performance, which will not at all satisfy the Modernists, and will be no more pleasing to Catholics. Moreover, he leaves it quite hazy as to what exactly he means by "the Church," which he thinks may, if it so desires, alter the phrasing of the Creed. Probably he intends the Catholic Church, but his hearers may, and many of them will understand this of the Church of England. It is with this alone, or possibly with "Protestant Christianity", that they are concerned, and they undoubtedly know that they will have a long time to wait before the whole Catholic Church revises the Creed for the benefit of "the modern man".

It is in another direction that he errs most egregiously. In the beginning of his lecture he quotes the Apostles' or Roman Creed in its most primitive form, and says, "it has been traced back, in all probability, to a period as early as the year 110 of our era, that is to a time hardly two generations removed from the deaths of St. Peter and St. Paul." But later on he remarks, "The Apostles' Creed is based on the language of the New Testament, which the Church accepts as her charter"—a most amazing statement for a scholar of Dr. Bernard's standing! He cannot really imagine that the Creed was drawn up after a careful study of the New Testament, if, as he himself affirms and as is doubtless true, it existed as early as the year 110. Moreover, he, as well as every other informed student, knows that, while all or nearly all the separate books were written before that date, there was no New Testament as we accept it, or in any proper sense of the term, until a far later time. Chronologically a creed which can be traced back to the year 110 cannot have been "based on the language of the New Testament." The fact, is, of course, that the Creed is earlier than the New Testament, and Dr. Bernard must be aware of this.

This statement that "the Church accepts the New Testament

as her Charter" is even more extraordinary. A charter is the term applied to a document which establishes a society or corporation or state, which society or corporation or state has no existence before the charter is granted. It is a written constitution, not framed by the body itself but received from some higher authority. Occasionally a new charter modifies or supercedes an older constitution. Now certainly the New Testament is not the Charter of the Church in the sense of having created it, for, as Dr. Bernard of course recognizes, the Church existed long before the first of the New Testament books were written, and each and all of them are products of the life of the Church, in quite the same way as the writings and speeches of Lincoln, Roosevelt and Wilson are the products of the life of our nation. He surely does not hold that when the Canon of the New Testament was partially fixed in the latter part of the second century, or when it was finally determined in the fourth, the previous constitution of the Church was modified or superseded!

In other words, this passage of the lecture, especially when it is taken in combination with the earlier statement, is nonsense, and harmful nonsense. It is precisely this absurd and unhistorical notion of the Church as having derived its faith from the Bible, that in the past has led men to build up vast systems on deductions from isolated texts. The same fallacy now permits others to suppose that, by the application of critical principles, they can discover and vaguely formulate a new doctrine to suit present tastes. It is easy to show from the earliest letter written by St. Paul that the Christians whom he addressed held already practically every article of the Creed, and it is in the light of this fact that this and the other books of the New Testament are to be read and understood.

Why Should They?

THOSE who are scrupulous in the observance of their religious duties sometimes give utterance to impatient and intolerant criticism of Protestants because they appear to take no interest in religion, or they do not go to church, or they never say their prayers; in short, because they act very much like pagans. No doubt it does get on the nerves of devout Catholics to be thrown

with people who pretend to be Christians and yet never show any outward evidence of it in the ordinary expressions of religious devotion.

To such criticisms our answer ordinarily would be, Why should they? Why should Protestants go to church, for example? They have never been taught any definite religious truths, nor has it ever been impressed upon them that they have any duties in the way of prayer or worship. They have been allowed to grow up with the notion that religion was largely a matter of the feelings. If one felt like praying or going to church, then it was perfectly natural to do so, but otherwise there was no obligation. Furthermore, they have been led to suppose that personal devotion to the minister was the main thing. If they were fortunate enough to be under a minister that they liked, why then naturally they would be regular attendants at the services at which he preached. But if they did not like their minister there surely could be no good reason why they should go to church.

Why should they? What is there attractive about the average Protestant conventicle? Recently, to be sure, Protestant churches have been erected whose interiors are more churchly and constructed according to the most approved Gothic standards. But usually the interior of a Protestant church is bare and uninteresting and irreligious. There is nothing about it that would suggest that it is a Christian place of worship. It might be a lecture or concert hall or the auditorium of a civic or literary society. There is rarely anything spiritual or sacred about it, or any association to which the worshippers therein become attached because it is connected with the most intense experiences in their religious life.

Why should they? Protestants have never been taught that they should go to church to worship God. There is almost no worship in their services, but simply the listening to a lecture, a sacred concert and a long extemporaneous prayer, together with a brief reading from Holy Scripture. In many Protestant services the reading from the Bible is the only distinctively religious action in the whole proceeding.

We have found it difficult to understand why any Protestants ever do go to church, or why they keep up any interest in religion. When we meet a man who tells us that he was brought

up in some kind of a Protestant creed and has not been to church for years, we do not feel in the least like scolding him; we have the greatest sympathy for him, and feel like saying, "we don't blame you in the least, that is exactly what we should do if we had the same religious notions as you have." It is conceivable that he might have been born with a religious temperament and when he found that his Protestant traditions did not give him what he needed he would make a search for some other form of religion that would satisfy his soul; but if he had no religious temperament it was quite natural that he should have fallen away from religion and lived in indifference, as so many of his fellow-Americans do.

With Catholics, of course, the matter is wholly different. They know better. They have been taught distinctly and categorically about the faith and practice of the Church. They know that when they go into a church they will find there the sacramental Presence of their Saviour. They know that the primary reason for going to church is to worship God in the way which He has appointed. They know that it is an obligation resting upon every faithful Christian to observe the Lord's Day by being present at the Lord's Service, which is the Holy Eucharist. They know that they are committing sin if they allow Sunday to go by without attending mass, unless they are hindered by ill health or some urgent necessity. They have been given much and of them much will be required.

Protestants have been given little, and even that little seems to be taken away from them by the progressive secularization of their religion. Protestantism is from its very nature self-destructive. It began by telling people that they did not have to perform good works, such as prayer, worship, confession, and so forth, but only have faith. The people have taken the Reformers at their word, and as a result Protestantism as a positive religious force is rapidly disintegrating.

The Bishop of Durham on Anglicanism

THE lectures which Dr. Hensley Henson, the Bishop of Durham, delivered at Stockholm, in which he attempted to enlighten the people of Sweden on the present religion of the Church of England, have just been published by Macmillan. There is a

frankly critical review of this book in the *London Times'* Literary Supplement of February 23, 1922. Dr. Henson, it appears, speaks disparagingly of episcopacy, has little to say in favor of Laud and the movement of which he was the leading spirit, magnifies Burnet and the Thirty-Nine Articles, displays contempt for the Oxford Movement, and finally visits all his pent-up wrath on the Anglo-Catholicism of our own day. The *Times* reviewer takes Dr. Henson severely to task for having given to Sweden a wrong impression of the real situation in the Church of England. He says, "After all, what the ecclesiastical historian in Sweden wants to know is not what the Bishop of Durham thinks the Church should be, but what it is."

Dr. Henson maintains that two interpretations of Anglicanism are now before the world and pressing for acceptance. One regards the Reformation as a tragic misfortune and insists that Anglicanism is Catholic and is most closely related to the unreformed Churches. The other interpretation places a high value upon the Reformation and regards Anglicanism as the most attractive expression of the Protestant religion, and therefore as having most points in common with the reformed Churches. Dr. Henson believes that only as the most refined version of Protestantism has Anglicanism any *raison d'être* or any spiritual future.

In reply to Dr. Henson's claim the *Times* reviewer enunciates his own interpretation of Anglicanism. Appearing in so authoritative a journal as the *London Times* the following view of the position of the Anglican Church seems to us to have considerable significance:

> This statement appears to us to misrepresent the genius of the Anglican Church. It starts from the assumption that Christianity is of two sorts, Catholic and Protestant. The essence of the Church of England is to assert that there is a third alternative, that there is an older historical Christianity which is not Protestant in the modern sense nor Catholic in the Roman sense, but something more comprehensive than either of them; and it is exactly this point which in the opinion of many people makes the value of Anglicanism at the present day. From one point of view it is true that the Church of England sides with the Protestant Churches. It definitely repudiates and always has repudiated the universal jurisdiction and the spiritual authority of the Papacy, the rule of the Italian Curia, medieval corruptions of Christianity, and the Tridentine reconstructions. But equally on the other hand does it oppose the claim of Protestantism to make a new beginning in the sixteenth century.

While not prepared to say amen to everything in this statement by the *Times* reviewer, we do nevertheless welcome it most heartily as coming from so authoritative a vehicle of English thought. We are most agreeably surprised that the *Times* has not placed its weighty influence unreservedly behind the Bishop of Durham and his Erastian views.

On Going Too Far

SINCE the early days of the Oxford movement there have always been Anglicans who considered themselves good Catholics and at the same time accused their brethren, whom they thought of as Catholic extremists, of going too far. The more moderate group, who delighted in calling themselves "old-fashioned" Catholics, held that these impetuous spirits were driving away many who would accept a more moderate program. They were making a tactical blunder. Their extreme practices would be certain to alienate some who thought that the whole thing was subtle Romanizing, and would result in driving many of the weaker brethren into the Roman fold.

Charges of this nature have been reiterated for a hundred years in Anglican circles. First, it was the old-fashioned Tractarians who claimed that the so-called ritualists were going too far in expressing outwardly through vestments and lights and incense the truths which the Tractarians firmly believed and fearlessly taught. Next, it was those who had advanced to the stage of timid and cautious ritualism, which consisted of candles and colored stoles and high matins; they criticised their more advanced brethren for introducing the mass as the chief act of worship in place of morning prayer. Next, it was those who believed in the mass as the highest form of Christian worship and the norm for every Sunday, but could not tolerate such extreme practices as Benediction, Exposition and Processions of the Blessed Sacrament. What the next stage of dangerous adventure will be, we do not know.

If it had not been for these aggressive and venturesome spirits who were bold enough to put into practice what their profession of the Catholic religion implied, we should all still be saying matins every Sunday in long black stoles. In every movement there are always to be found two classes of temperaments. In one

class are those who are easy-going and lethargic. They are reluctant to make any changes and they will not force anything that is unpopular upon an unwilling congregation. The other class is made up of those who are restless and dissatisfied and who insist upon making drastic improvements. We see the same two temperaments in every department of life. Some people, for example, are perfectly content to live on in an old, dilapidated house until it falls down over their heads; others are always planning some addition or some new way of arranging the rooms or a new color scheme for the interior.

It is fortunate that there are among Anglo-Catholics a goodly number of leaders whom God has endowed with the restless temperament. If it were not for them we should all be forever sitting still in comfortable indolence and oriental immobility. We need their idealism and splendid vision and divine discontent to push us along toward the complete embodiment of our ideals in a Church that is unmistakably Catholic outwardly as well as inwardly.

The Tongues of the Clergy

WE sometimes wonder whether the clergy sufficiently realize that they are often primarily responsible for disloyalty to the Church and her priests on the part of many of their people. From talking with those who know something of the working of the various departments of the Church in different sections of the country we have become convinced that this is true. Loyalty and respect for the spiritual leaders of the Church and for the Church itself would be less difficult to obtain from the laity if the bishops and priests gave them better examples of loyalty in their own attitude toward each other and the Church's work.

As one travels about the country it is a frequent experience to hear petty and sometimes serious criticisms from those who ought to be the spiritual leaders of the Church. Some of these criticisms are guarded and are made under circumstances where they are not likely to be quoted; other criticisms are recklessly uttered and create an atmosphere of irreverence and disrespect and disloyalty that cannot easily be overcome. This applies both to bishops and priests and is esecially prevalent in the weaker dioceses and missionary jurisdictions. It may often be due to economic pressure, discouragement and isolation.

Are we not all a little too ready to launch forth in criticism upon the administrative headquarters of the Church, and are we not somewhat too thoughtless of the consequences of such remarks? Until the provinces and dioceses are stronger than they are today, some sort of central organization will be necessary to keep the Church together. If we may reason from the experience of the Roman Catholic Church, it will always be necessary. A better spirit would prevail among all our workers and Church people if the criticisms that must be made could be constructive, based on assured facts and accompanied by practical suggestions for improving conditions.

A Suggestion for the Church Congress

WE mean no reflection on the program of the Church Congress which has just been held in Baltimore when we say that we hope in the future our American Church Congress may profit by the experience of the Anglo-Catholics in their great London Congress of two years ago, and in their Priests' Convention at Oxford last summer, and hereafter devote their program to the consideration of one subject only, in its different aspects and from different points of view. The English Church Congress has in its next program emulated the example set by the Anglo-Catholics and is to treat of only one subject in its various phases. The Modernists did the same in their conference at Girton.

The advantage of this method is that it will give permanent value to the published report of the addresses made at the Church Congress. Heretofore they have dealt with various unrelated subjects with no sort of unity binding them together, and consequently they have been of purely ephemeral interest. We doubt if anyone ever refers to the reports of past Congresses. The report of the Anglo-Catholic Priests' Convention at Oxford is a handbook on the subject of priestly efficiency which will always prove useful. It is even more valuable than the ordinary handbook on pastoral theology, because in the Oxford Convention each subject was handled by a man who spoke with expert knowledge of the subject assigned to him. We believe that if our Church Congress should take for its deliberations some such general subject as prayer, evangelization, the moral message of the Church to Americans, or revision of the Prayer Book, it would attract a larger

audience of clergy and lay people from all directions and its report would be bought and eagerly read by the clergy and the more intelligent laity in all parts of the country. We humbly and respectfully make this suggestion to the Executive Committee of the Church Congress.

World Conference on Faith and Order

ANNOUNCEMENT has been made that the next World Conference on Faith and Order, comprising seventy-seven national Churches of the world in the movement toward Church Unity, will be held in Washington, D. C., in May, 1925. Group conferences of the many communions represented in the World Conference will be held for preparation and study in the intervening period, according to Robert H. Gardiner, Secretary of the World Conference, of Gardiner, Maine. The work in anticipation of the world gathering will extend both to the clergy and lay men and women, even including thousands of individual congregations.

According to plans just announced, each Commission representing a national Church will convene as soon as possible to take steps to promote the conferences in both large and small areas. Then each pastor, priest and rector will organize conferences in his neighborhood following the organization work of the presiding officer of his territory. A general appeal will be sent to laymen and laywomen to urge their direct co-operation and study in connection with their particular Church. Already the World Conference has established contact with many thousand laymen in every part of the world who are desirous of forwarding the movement toward Church Unity.

It is expected that the Continuation Committee of the World Conference will meet in London in 1924. This committee includes representatives of the following communions: Anglican, Armenian, Baptist, Congregational, Czechoslovak, Disciples, Eastern Orthodox, Friends, German Evangelical, Lutheran, Methodist, Moravian, Old Catholic, Presbyterian, Reformed, South India United.

Church Unity and Credal Requirements*

Rt. Rev. Charles Fiske, D.D., LL.D.

A CHIEF characteristic of the American Episcopal Church is its unfailing amiability.

Now amiability may be a beautiful virtue, or it may become a besetting sin. It may be the happy expression of one's kindly attitude towards life. For the most part Anglican Churchmen have never been narrow, aggressive, or disputatious. Modern Puritanism finds little in common with our ways. We do not stand at attention to pick quarrels with people who enjoy life in other fashion than our own ideas commend. We do not engage in violent agitation, nor are we fond of dictatorial methods of moral reform. We live and let live. We have never set forth a book of discipline. We have little love for personal piety based upon and backed up by legal enforcement. On the whole we are an agreeable and pleasant people to live with.

Our theological position also has usually been well balanced and kindly. We have never been harsh in our judgment of the beliefs of others. The Articles of Religion (called our "forty stripes save one") were not a challenge of orthodoxy, but a more or less successful attempt at a comprehensiveness which would include without compromise of principle. Midway between Rome and Protestantism, we tried to set forth the truth in each system and to express the faith of the ages in terms that would hold within the Anglican communion sympathizers with both extremes of thought. Of course, violently aggressive extremists refused to be satisfied with what seemed to them a compromise, but for the most part the Articles accomplished their purpose, and at any rate the Anglican Church was fairly successful in combining evangelical truth with catholic order. As a matter of fact we have usually lived on amiable terms both with Rome and Dissent, even at the expense of considerable internal discomforts of our own! Our theology, our practice, our discipline have made for peace.

But amiability has its perils. It may be so sweet as to be cloying. I, for example, may be so mildly propitiatory as to cause grave suspicion of my moral earnestness. Liberality towards men

*This paper was read in the recent Church Congress in Baltimore, April 25, 1922.

of other minds *may* indicate an absence of deep conviction. Kindliness in matters of discipline—as any one could testify who knows much about the internal affairs of the average diocese—may mean simply that we haven't as much backbone as a chocolate eclair. Amiability may manifest itself in flabby indifference in faith, with a harmlessly negative and conventional code of morals; a halting and apologetic substitute for vital religion; a stodgy and stolid mediocrity, unconscious of its failures because unambitious in its spiritual ideals; without earnestness of purpose, without enthusiasm, without serious anxiety to be of worth in the Kingdom, without militant and aggressive adventure for Christ.

II

The amiability of Anglicanism is nowhere more manifest than in our attitude towards Church unity. The whole movement of the present day received its impulse from us. We naturally dislike the sectarian spirit. Our own liberality in what we deem nonessentials has made us impatient of the narrowness of denominationalism. Moreover, our neighborly attitude towards Protestantism has made us conscious of the weakness and ineffectiveness of disunion, while at the same time our ideal of comprehensiveness has enabled us to grasp a Catholic conception of the Church. We believe in One Holy, Catholic Church; and the clergy, at least, put loyalty to the whole Church above partisan zeal for our own branch of the Church.

For a time our desire for unity led us to reach out hopefully towards Rome—and we were repulsed. Then we made eyes towards the East, though apparently no one except ourselves knew we were trying to flirt with the Mistress of Orthodoxy. Now we are extending friendly hands towards Protestantism, and for all our friendliness but succeed in being seriously misunderstood. Yet, however often we may be ignored, repelled or misunderstood, there is something in the genius of Anglican Catholicity that makes it impossible to give up the effort towards unity. Because we put loyalty to the Catholic ideal above belief in our particular branch of the Church, we naturally desire unity as the expression of the ideal. We can never be content until the family of Christ has caught again the family spirit, settled its differences and come together in peace and unity, with mutual understanding, mutual concessions if need be, mutual love and appreciation and singleness of purpose and effort. A less amiable folk would cease following what some

regard as a will o' the wisp. A more aggressive people would be content to proselyte and spread its own propaganda rather than urge co-operation. Our liberality forbids such a course. Our amiability is a virtue.

But is it also a vice—a weakness, a sin, a curse?

Chesterton, who says many a true word in such humorous and startling fashion that he seems but to jest, tells us that we talk too much about "respecting" this or that person's religion, forgetting that the way to respect a religion is to treat it *as* a religion; that is, to ask what are its tenets and what are the consequences of such tenets. "Historians," he says, "seem to have forgotten two facts—first, that men act from ideas; and, second, that it might therefore be well to discover *which ideas*." It is an amiable weakness and a fatal error not to know or care about the creed from which a people's customs, good or bad, will necessarily flow.

And he also reminds us that this sentimental kindliness only irritates people who have real convictions. "We are always saying to a Mormon or a Moslem, 'Never mind about your religion; come to my arms;' to which he naturally replies, 'But I do mind about my religion and I advise you to mind your eye.'" He has an amusing story of a militant Christian and a blatant Atheist who became firm friends because, amid a world of indifferent folk, they discovered that they alone were in dead earnest about the things they accepted or rejected.

We Anglicans, in an endeavor to satisfy widely divergent theological views, have often been amicable to the point of ambiguity and obscurity. Some one has said that the "Reformation Settlement" was really a thing which left many things unsettled, a sort of "gentlemen's agreement" that if possible they were to be left permanently undetermined. There was some virtue in this. It was a characteristically English way of progress through compromise. But it may be questioned whether the general moral effect upon Anglicanism has not been to make us dangerously expert in balancing on the fence. Enthusiasm, one way or the other, is apt to be with us a lost art. We have developed a spirit of languid tolerance which plays with great realities and will neither assert nor deny. Our religion, too often, expends itself in the effort to live on terms of peace with everybody. We sometimes forget that to have the fierce sun of truth beat hot upon the black shadow of

doubt is better than to live in a universal mist which makes the world a blur and befogs our moral perceptions.

Sometimes one feels that we are allowing our besetting sin to beguile us into a pleasing self-deception in the matter of Christian unity. It takes a little courage to say this, because one is apt to be misunderstood. Moreover, where the underlying purpose is so worthy, one dislikes to be critical or contentious.

III.

The demand for unity has become insistent. Back of the demand lie many motives. The "man in the street" gives the movement tolerant approval because he is impatient of "dogmas that divide." Hardheaded laymen back it for practical and economic reasons. Advocates of social and industrial reform are interested because they look toward a united Church as the only agency through which moral impulses can be given to a new social order. More and more the clergy long for it because they see the weakness of a divided Christendom, unable constantly to speak the truth, boldly to rebuke vice, patiently to suffer, if need be, for the truth's sake, and bravely to bear witness for Christ, the futility of an army even of friendly allies without a united command, its inability to win the war for righteousness or hold for Christ a field already won. At its best the demand for unity is a real hunger of the heart, a passionate desire of men of many minds but of one spirit—the spirit of Christ their Master.

But is it not true, then, that the stronger our desire for unity becomes and the deeper our motive, the more anxious we should be lest a false unity deceive our hopes? It will not do, in this of all things, to allow ourselves to be dazzled by glittering generalities or soothed into content by sentimental aspirations. Because we want the thing so hard we want to make sure that it is the real thing we are offered. Therefore, before we can consider the means towards unity or the terms on which it is to be based, we need to make sure of our conception of unity itself. It will be fatal to refuse to face facts; tragically ludicrous if we deceive ourselves by amiable sentimentality.

I am so lightly tied by political party loyalty that in days of crisis I have often dreamed of one national party united for service; but how long would Republicans and Democrats stay united if they merely came together from impulse, with a common desire

for public good, but without actually trying to resolve their differences of political faith and practice or seeking to find a common platform as the expression of their common purpose? A great party has a political creed; it has inherited principles and cherished ideas; it has underlying convictions about government; all these influence its present ideas and methods. Other parties have other conceptions and convictions and are equally influenced by them. The Republicans and the Democrats will never unite with the Socialists and the Labor Party by declaring that opinions do not count. They may cry forever, "Come to my arms, dear brother," but how shall they work together except they be agreed?

And it seems to me equally true that a Church unity mainly bent on politely ignoring differences and calling one another by kindly names would be similarly charged with centrifugal impulses. It would fly to pieces as rapidly as it was patched together. There are fundamentals in religion on which churches may unite, because the fundamental principles of religion go deeper than the political principles of democracy. There are nonessentials on which we may agree to disagree, because we put loyalty to Christ above all party or sectarian spirit. Just now, our difficulty is, that we seem to be afraid to declare what we consider fundamental and anxious to sentimentalize into ambiguity all serious differences. Before we can accomplish much in preparing the way for unity, we must agree upon our goal. Before we discuss any basis of union for the Church we must discover what we believe in common about the Church. It is foolish and futile to seek for unity save as first we are willing courageously to face primary considerations, without which real unity is unattainable and the mere amalgamation which we substitute for it would contain so many discordant elements that it would quickly fly apart again into a multiplicity of fragments.

We want church unity. Well, first, then, are we agreed on the need of a Church? Is the very idea of corporate Christianity the forethought of Christ or merely the afterthought of men? At the preliminary conference in Geneva, on Faith and Order, Bishop Gore pressed this point strongly and with the courage of consecrated sincerity and conviction. "I want to know," he said, "whether we cannot go back to the beginning and ask ourselves what really is the mind of Christ and what really were the intentions of His first interpreters with regard to the unity of the

Church. I want to know whether we can start afresh and whether we can in any way agree as to what we mean by the Church and by the unity of the Church. Do we find an obligatory membership in a visible society to be the characteristic of Christianity? In the New Testament I do not seem to find anything which is entitled to call itself membership of Christ which is not also membership of this one visible body." And Bishop Gore then went on to show that in going back to fundamentals, he found also "the authority of a common faith which was for the apostles the *sine qua non* in the matter of fellowship; secondly, there was the obligation of sacraments as a means of divine grace and at the same time a social ceremony; and, thirdly, there was a divinely commissioned ministry, the obligation to adhere to which was to be a divine discipline upon the universally disruptive tendency of human nature."

Such considerations as these, it seems to me, we are bound to press home to ourselves. Behind any movement for Christian unity must lie the question, Are we actually agreed that the name of Jesus is the only name under Heaven whereby men may be saved? Are we agreed that His earthly life is truly the unveiling of Deity? Before we go on to Church unity, we must face the question, Are we actually agreed that a visible Church is really necessary and that membership in it is of obligation? Before we can logically talk about any arrangements for ordination in the united Church, we must ask, Are we actually agreed that any sort of a divinely commissioned ministry was really established for the continuance of the faith? Never mind, for the present, whether it be a priestly ministry or not; is *any* ministry actually necessary or could we get on without such an arm of the Church; a little uncomfortably, perhaps, at first, but rather gladly after we had learned modern methods of work? And the sacraments. Are we actually agreed even on a simple basis of belief about them? Are they means of grace ordained by Christ? or beautiful ceremonies sanctioned by Him? or ancient rites dating from later days and evolved out of other religions? Why talk longer about a united Church, if we are not agreed in the first place on the necessity of a Church? If the Church be nothing more than a convenience—on the whole a very satisfactory method of securing unity of Christian purpose—then there is no actual compelling motive for becoming a Church member, and the question of uniting all these

conveniently useful societies into a common order becomes for me wholly academic—or shall I say, economic? I can't, for the life of me, get up any enthusiasm about it; or more than a very little interest.

IV.

Now I think these are all questions which in our amiable tolerance we have weakly avoided. And I do not think we help the cause by continuing to make them taboo. I have no doubt that concerted action by the Bishops of the Church could produce next week a seemingly marvelous activity towards unity, if we are to content ourselves with unrealities. If I desired, I could receive Protestant ministers into our priesthood almost every month—I am sure I could have captured half a dozen last year. But I didn't want them and the Church couldn't use them. They were merely unhappy and restless where they were and hopefully optimistic as to the peace of soul and comfort of body which awaited them in the Episcopal fold. They did not really know the mind of the Church; they had not caught its spirit; they were not of its genius; they never could have been adapted to its ways; in some cases they were hopelessly ignorant of its faith and worship. You couldn't have made Churchmen out of them in a lifetime. Would they or ourselves have been any happier had I opened my arms to them and rejoiced over what I was pleased to call their conversion?

In the same way the united Church of which we dream would have no strength if it were made up of men whose ways and thought were foreign to one another. A Baptist minister who spoke to me recently with great enthusiasm of our own Church and his desire to enter its ministry, during the conference we had, proved to be Unitarian in belief and stated that large numbers of his brother ministers were of the same way of thinking. A Congregational minister who wrote to say that "he felt he could find more congenial worship and more effective methods or work" with us, proved to have so little conception of the Church's faith as I understand it that he had not taken the trouble to have any of his children baptized, though the oldest was eighteen. Ministers without number in every Protestant communion will evade the question of our Lord's divinity. "The word divine has so many shades of meaning," said one of them to Dr. Waterman, "that it is impossible to limit religious fellowship to persons who attach any one

particular idea to that word." The very idea of sacramental grace has been lost among many Protestants, and as for a divinely established Church it is often a thing undreamed of. In answer to the question, "To what end is Protestantism moving?" Dr. Waterman replies: "The movement has moved from certainty to uncertainty. It must go on from uncertainty to unbelief. When any group of religious men have long believed, they will go on believing for a while, even after their own grounds for believing these same things are entirely gone. But in the long run reason will assert itself against such an irrational tradition. When the foundations upon which beliefs once rested are gone out of men's minds, men will, as I say, go on believing as they did before, for a while. But as they grow to be conscious that they know nothing and have no grounds for knowing, in the next generation or in a few generations at most belief will disappear. It is an end inevitable. Unbelief must come."

In Bishop Gore's latest work, "Belief in God," we find a statement of conclusions much like these, and the statement is of unique value because it is made by one who has always been dominated by a passion for truth and is recognized as possessing a remarkable frankness and a judicial temper which comes from a very deep and fine humility of mind. He points out that the real question at issue now goes back of differences as to ecclesiastical order, or criticism, or sacramental truth—our weakness, our separations and our religious confusion are due to fundamental differences of conception about God. The real question is whether many who are regarded as Christian teachers have not actually discarded the old idea of a divine revelation as rationally untenable. Pulpits are occupied by men who, quite unconsciously perhaps, have returned to the Greek philosophic theory of God—among Protestants everywhere there is a relapse upon a kind of Pantheism, with a feeble hold on the divine transcendence or even upon divine personality.

What Dr. Waterman says is not an exaggeration of conditions among Protestants generally—indeed, his diagnosis explains what is really the disease from which some of our own clergy, and a great many of our own people, are suffering. It is not, of course, a charge to be brought against all Protestants. It is certainly not true of many splendid Christian leaders with whom it has been my privilege to associate. But it is true enough of the general ten-

dency of Protestantism, both outside our own communion and within it, to make us chary of broad schemes of unity which are more concerned with amalgamation than with the resultant of truth on which unity is to be based. Whether it be true or not, however, the charge is one that deserves consideration. My one contention is, that such consideration of the actual facts should be a preliminary to any program of unity. And along with that contention goes my expression of a suspicion that we are refusing to speak of the facts above a whisper because we fear to offend others or are a little doubtful as to discoveries we may make about ourselves.

Personally, I have too much admiration for many of the religious leaders of Protestantism to believe that a frank discussion need cause hopeless offense. I have too much respect for the convictions of those who have given up beliefs which were not always commended to them by the lives of Churchmen to think that they would avoid honest explanation of differences. And I have too firm a faith in the reasonableness of the Church's doctrine and practice to fear that full and free conferences on such differences would be fruitless of better understanding.

V.

Do such considerations bring the whole matter of unity to an absolute *impasse?* I think not. The truth is, they do not change the situation in any degree; they merely compel us to face facts. We have been shutting our eyes in amiable dread lest we should see unpleasant differences; we have politely refused to believe that there are any obstacles. The cause of unity will not be aided by such self-deception. The surest way to advance it is by bravely recognizing facts and honestly meeting conditions. The need of unity has never been felt as strongly as now; the desire for it has never been so keen; the movement has never before developed on such spiritual lines. All this creates an atmosphere in which we may better consider our convictions. The longing for unity has now become a real hunger of the heart for faith. It has brought us to penitence for past errors and mistakes. It *can* bring us to shame and regret for past prejudices and misunderstandings. There could not be better conditions for the consideration of primary convictions. Too often, in the past, theological discussions have been a matching of wits. Mind has met mind in intel-

lectual debate. Now heart may meet heart in penitent effort towards mutual understanding.

This is all the more necessary because we cannot think of the Church that is to be as a sort of highest common factor of all the sects. It is to be a splendid combination of all the finest qualities of Christian faith that are now displayed in separation. It will hold truths in due balance as conviction is matched by conviction and as realities, felt all too strongly by some because wholly unappreciated by others, are now set in place against other realities in a rounded completeness of faith, worship and practice. All this means that our real task is to make others understand the things we hold essential while we seek to appreciate the things which to them are equally valuable. Instead, a false charity has impelled us politely to assure each other that everybody is very much alike and that nothing really matters. For myself I am convinced that the road to unity is not a mere line of least resistance. Unity will not be made effective by casting convictions into the discard; rather will it come when convictions are frankly discussed, constructively not controversially.

I honestly believe our own Church has grown in grace very wonderfully since the unity proposals were first made. I speak the whole truth when I say that we have grown in penitent acknowledgment of past narrowness and of snobbish superiority. I think we have grown in fuller appreciation of some of the treasures others have guarded. Despite what has been said above, I believe many of us in the Church have really come to think of unity less as a compromise for the sake of peace and more as a comprehension for the sake of truth. For this reason I believe the time has come when we should honestly and bravely seek to explain ourselves and out of our differences reach towards the unity which will synthesize contraries and apparent contradictions and so reach a wholeness of truth by combining the positive teaching that lies back of every denial.

Does this appear to be a remote vision? Yes; but, to quote a brother Bishop, in spiritual things there are stranger liberties taken with time. "Often there are dreary pauses, wearily prolonged—years of piteous suspense, when nobody stirs, and nothing happens. And then, at the very moment when our hearts despair, there comes a sudden and swift movement; age-long barriers crumple up; walls fall flat; the work of years is fulfilled in a rush;

the impossible has happened before we can believe it. We are drawing nearer and nearer to one another, in spite of vexing jars. There is a breath of larger air stirring in the silence. Prejudices and suspicions are falling away. Ancient discords have lost their violence. We move amid larger horizons; the intellectual currents pass freely to and fro from one to another; and the brotherhood of service in social causes knits us into closer fellowship."

That I want to say first, and then secondly I wish to add that if I have laid stress upon the need of some basis of credal truth for a unity of the churches it is not because I am urging doctrine merely as doctrine. The Church, of course, does not exist for the purpose of formulating creeds and proclaiming dogmas. Moreover, the Church's duty is not merely to teach the faith; but so to teach it that it may frame and fashion the lives of her children. The creed is more than creed. It is at once creed and character, dogma and devotion, logic and life. Nor is faith mere intellectual assent to credal formularies; it is receptivity of soul; it is the consent of the whole man—mind, conscious, heart, will—to the will of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. When, therefore, we urge some fundamental agreement of faith as a prerequisite to unity, we do not ask for agreement as an intellectual covenant or even as an intellectual basis for action. Rather, we consider such an agreement on essentials to be necessary because, with Chesterton, we believe ideas control conduct. Our whole thought of the meaning and purpose of life depends upon our grasp of spiritual realities. False or imperfect doctrines will and must result in lives faulty and maimed, which might have been complete.

The end of faith and worship is life. If this is so, the full Christian creed is vitally necessary. Its presentation should be as simple as possible, reduced to real essentials, but in these essential elements it must be consistently presented and fully preserved, because out of it springs the Christian character. The ideal life which we call the Christian life sprang out of the faith which we call the Christian faith. As Scott Holland says, "We cannot unravel the threads which knit the character which we know in its developed form as Christian, from the creed which appears, at every single point of the character, as its inherent and vital background." I do not believe that it is possible to drop out of the law of Christ its theological value and yet retain its ethical value.

With Scott Holland again, I believe that the sickness of the hour has resulted from the attempt to abstract the creed of the Church from the ethical ideal of the Church. "Men are sick and miserable and weak as soon as their thought has no definite relation to their moral practice. The absurd and ignorant assumption that Christianity is a separate matter from its dogmatic belief persuades men to accept a false division, which attempts to break up the undivided unity of the man, to sever the inseparable. No wonder they find themselves enfeebled and ensnared by an impossible divorce."

Finally, may I say as strongly as it is possible to say it, that in any doctrinal basis for reunion, we must be over-careful to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials. In the interpretation of truth as in the expression of devotion, there must always be accommodation to temperament and taste. Even that will be possible, if we can work back to the core of Christian faith. Is it hopeless to expect that? I do not think so. But I do think in order to secure such a basis of agreement, we must all have something more far-reaching and radical. We all of us need something of conversion if we are to see visions and appreciate ideals. We need to return to God. Let me make my own, with but a slight change of language, the words of Bishop Gore, in his recent book:

Of such a return, he says, he sees no signs. That does not prove that they may not soon be manifested. Out of our necessity, God may act. "God has smitten, but in general we have not sought Him. Taught by the Prophets, I am ready to anticipate further scathing judgments. Taught also by the prophets, I look with unquenchable faith to the divine purpose of progress. Through all the catastrophes and judgments which widespread apostasy from God brings the purpose remains and the end is sure. No right effort is going to be lost. And the instrument through which God works is the faithful remnant of those who believe Him and obey Him at all costs. Of such there is as large a body and as faithful as at any previous period of history. What is needful for them is to think out their principles individually and collectively, so that they shall know what they believe and why they believe it."

If in what has been said I have moved you and myself to this test of reality, you will pardon all that has been said amiss and God will use its imperfection to His greater glory.

American Unitarianism

Rev. Frederick Sherman Arnold, M.A., S.T.B.

WE have long thought that a study of American Unitarianism is very instructive in regard to current Protestantism. In fact, we believe that Unitarianism is the key to Protestantism. We think this partly because Unitarianism is almost the only form of Protestantism that has quite eliminated the whole tradition of Catholic Christianity, partly because, for that reason, Unitarianism is the logical limit of Protestantism, and partly because, as a matter of fact, all Protestantism does actually seem to tend toward Unitarianism.

In saying this we refer to current Protestantism. No such statements would have been true one hundred or one hundred and fifty years ago. Historic Protestantism was a different religion, but the Protestantism of our grandfathers and their forebears is already a matter of past history.

Of the three streams that the Protestant revolution loosed, High-churchmanship, whether Lutheran or Anglican, Calvinism, and Anabaptistry, the third, the democratic, unconfessional, and anti-Catholic tendency, has overflowed and absorbed the other two. Not that current Protestantism is Anabaptist. Rather, current Protestantism is democratic, unconfessional and anti-Catholic. Calvinism has vanished. High churchmanship has at last discovered the logic of its own position, which is Catholic. So doing, what remains of high churchmanship has drawn apart from and, in a sense, disowned Protestantism. Current Protestantism has at last dissolved into the position which perhaps without their knowing it was always the logic of the Anabaptists. It is democratic, unconfessional and anti-Catholic. How Calvinism, before it vanished, brought about this dissolution is an interesting study. Calvinism was the ferment. Current Protestantism is the product of the fermentation. It may further be charged that a point of view that is democratic and unconfessional has no authority to set up any standards against the world. Therefore current Protestantism has become simply the organized ecclesiastical expression of worldliness. Perhaps a study of American Unitarianism might illustrate these conclusions.

The Unitarian Church in America is about one hundred years

old. We might count its years from the organization of the first Unitarian parish, King's Chapel, Boston, in 1785; or from the appointment of the Unitarian, Henry Ware, as Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard College in 1805; or from William Ellery Channing's sermon in Baltimore in 1819; or from the organization of the American Unitarian Association in 1825. Unitarianism, being an opinion, or even an attitude of mind, existed long before it organized itself. Those, however, are the dates of the denomination.* Unitarians claim, we think rightly, that Unitarianism was forming in men's minds much earlier; that, indeed, it begins with a reaction against the preaching of Jonathan Edwards and the "Great Awakening" of 1735. Beside, it is pointed out that there were Unitarian tendencies in seventeenth century Puritanism. John Milton, for instance, was one of the "high Arians."

Unitarianism, then, is over one hundred years old. It has had time to grow in. Not only has it had time; it has had leadership. Unitarianism justly boasts a roll of the greatest names of the nineteenth century. Some of America's greatest preachers, William Ellery Channing, Theodore Parker, Dr. Bellows; many of America's greatest scholars, Noyes, Palfrey, Sparkes; America's most renowned philosopher, Emerson, and a whole school of philosophy; and nearly the whole New England group of literary leaders; beside these, a brilliant line of public men, from President Adams to President Taft, and the great New England names of Quincy, Bigelow, Shaw, Lowell, Perkins, Appleton. Needless to say that wealth and social position, whatever these things may be worth to a church, though they are not worth so much as some might suppose, have fallen to the lot of Unitarianism.

After one hundred years of such leadership, such intellectual distinction, such high personal character, such wealth and social position as few denominations have ever been able to boast, what are the statistical results? Truly, *"Parturiunt montes; nascetur ridiculus mus."*

According to the *World Almanac* for 1922, there are 82,515 members of the Unitarian Church and 399 church buildings. About equal to one diocese of the Episcopal Church and not so very much bigger than a large Roman Catholic parish! In fact, if it were

*American Church History Series. "Unitarians," by Joseph Henry Allen, D.D.

not for the intellectual, social and financial prominence of the little eighty thousand, such that they weigh very much more than they count, a man might justly say: "There are practically no Unitarians in America." The figure is much less than one-tenth of one per cent of our people. So much for the statistics of the Unitarian denomination.

Yet it is our belief that there are more Unitarians in America than there are Protestants of any other sort. In support of this belief no statistics are available. There are, of course, a few other small sects whose official doctrines might be considered Unitarian: Universalists, Hicksite Friends, Christian Baptists, Swedenborgians. Their figures will not bring us very far nor are we thinking of them. We are thinking rather of the attitude of thousands within the orthodox denominations and of more thousands of the unchurched. There are here no statistics. We can only appeal to the experience of persons who have had serious talks about religion at noon hour among workingmen, in the smoking compartment of railway carriages, in city clubs, in college dormitories and other places where people are willing to talk. Perhaps we are wrong. Proof is impossible. Yet it is our belief that a majority of the Protestant laity of America is more or less Unitarian.

If we are right in this opinion, and many will agree with us, this is the shame of Unitarianism. It would not be shameful to be small. That might be due to the hardness of heart or to the dullness of mind of the people. But to be great and yet small, to be millions amongst whom only eighty thousand can be induced to confess the faith in public, to be popular and yet to be disowned, to have changed the thought and life of multitudes without having communicated to more than a handful enough of faith, enthusiasm, and loyalty to declare themselves, to undermine other churches without winning over the apostates, to unchurch multitudes without being able to rechurch them, this is dark shame.

Nor can it be pleaded that these phenomena are inherent in a Unitarian theology. That is not so. We suppose we shall not be disputed in saying that Mohammedanism holds a Unitarian theology. Mohammedanism has converted, edified and organized millions and sent them to die as martyrs and conquer as heroes. Even today that mighty un-Christian Unitarianism of the Orient is able to snatch triumphs from before the eyes of the missionaries

of the cross. No, the trouble is not that Unitarianism is Unitarian. The trouble is that Unitarianism is just the precise sort of Unitarianism that it is. We may even find that the trouble is that Unitarianism is not Unitarian at all.

Unitarianism has no creed. That is what we mean by calling a religious tendency unconfessional. A heresy trial is impossible. Even if a pastor were to begin preaching the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation we do not see what the Unitarians could do to him. We doubt very much if they would wish to do anything to him except to reason with him. Of course, if his congregation did not like it—and they probably would not—they might stop going to church and contributing money. Then he might have to resign. Such things are common among all religious bodies outside of the Roman Catholics. Unitarians have assured us, and we believe justly, that there was nothing on the Unitarian side to prevent a Trinitarian from being a Unitarian. Of course, a Trinitarian would not wish to remain in the Unitarian fellowship unless he were a dishonest man, but that is another question. Unitarians may be Arians or Deists or Pantheists or Theosophists or Spiritualists or Materialists. We believe some of them actually are each of these things. We see no positive resemblance between William Ellery Channing or Andrew Peabody, and Emerson and Moncure D. Conway, and John W. Chadwick and Minot J. Savage. We do not believe a creed that would satisfy one of these men fully would have satisfied one of the others fully. Yet all of them were Unitarian ministers. We may be wrong, but it seems to us that these thinkers are bound together not by affirmation, but by denial. The High Arians would confess the Apostles' Creed and they believed in the Bible as the inspired word of God. They, of course, denied the Nicene Creed. This denial links them to men who deny also the Apostles' Creed and the inspiration of the Bible in the exclusive sense, to other men who deny all miracles and the supernatural, and to other men who deny the personality of God and teach a sort of Pantheistic mysticism, finally to men who are Agnostic and do not think the term God has any definite meaning for them.

As Dr. Andrew Peabody is said to have been the last of the Arians, we may as well pass over them as a transition stage and come down to Unitarianism today. Unitarianism denies the consubstantial Deity of the Son of God incarnate in our Lord Jesus

Christ. Unitarianism denies the supernatural element in the Gospel. For Unitarianism our Lord is a man just as Socrates is a man. Unitarianism pretends to accept our Lord as a moral leader. For morality, however, Unitarianism does not go to the Gospel, but to the best thought of today. One moral teaching of Christ, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is regarded, practically, as the Christian contribution to ethics. Asceticism, humility, lowliness, repentence, purity in the Catholic sense, which condemns divorce and race suicide and extols celibacy, are rejected by Unitarianism. Of course, we do not refer to official denials, because Unitarianism is unconfessional and has no dogmas or anathemas. Unitarianism, then, rejects the supernatural, affirms humanitarianism, with a vague reverence for Christ and with no particular doctrine of God at all.

Naturally each separate Unitarian has some definite ideas about God, but Unitarianism as a whole has not. Pantheists and Deists cannot both be right, but they can both be Unitarians. Some Unitarians are Pantheists, some are Deists, some are Agnostics, and some used to be Arians. To us, that means simply that Unitarianism is not Unitarian. Mohammedanism is Unitarian, but Unitarianism is not. Among them the term Unitarian is understood in a negative sense. It means the denial of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. As they do not hold to the inerrancy of Holy Scripture in faith and morals, they have divested themselves of the last remnants of Catholic Christianity. They are unconfessional and anti-Catholic and they are democratic in the sense that one man's idea is as good as another's. There are, we believe, millions of them, but they do not come forward to be counted because this point of view is not a religion at all. It is simply worldliness.

By this time we shall be asked why anybody, why the eighty thousand, come forward to be counted? With some of them, of course, their Unitarianism is simply due to blood or marriage. It is hereditary. However, there are zealous Unitarians. We hesitate to dogmatize. Where they themselves put forward no creeds or definitions, we cannot be on solid ground. We can only give our impressions. What we think is this. Among the many millions in America who hold the Unitarian position on its negative side, the Unitarian Church consists of the intellectual *elite*. They are the individuals for whom the enthusiasm for the higher natural life burns with such emotional fervor that it resembles religion.

It is not religion. Religion is the binding up of man to God. But Unitarianism as a whole has no doctrine of God, no "orthodoxy." Unitarianism is not definitely Unitarian.

An intellectual *elite!* That, we believe, is whither all Protestantism is tending. Rejecting creeds, opposing Catholicism, which is the only surviving Christian tradition, democratic, in the sense that one man's thought is as good as another man's thought—God and the supernatural are in the process of elimination from Protestantism. Some fine and delicate souls there will always be who will burn with a human desire for the highest that is naturally possible. For the great mass there remains the worldliness of the world: the movies, automobiles, sensuousness, and the crude struggle over the things of this life between plutocracy and socialism.

What Shall the Clergy Preach About?

By a Layman

FOR a layman to hand down an opinion on what the clergy should preach about is a large order. It was perturbing, and obeying the herd instinct I took refuge in putting out a feeler to a college club dinner table. Around it were sitting an editor of a heavily circulated New York morning newspaper, an architect trained at the Beaux Arts, the president of a trucking company, the publisher of a motion picture trade journal, the merchandise manager of a popular priced department store, an advertising agent, and a lawyer. They were a band of pilgrims as typical of the modern age as were Chaucer's Canterbury adventurers characteristic of theirs. My question stopped the bridge conversation and annoyed the editor, who was recounting a slam, and he shook his head sadly. But they all fell upon me, and each had his answer. To tell the truth, their efforts, though well meant, helped me not at all. I felt myself slipping out into deeper water than ever.

One of the group was really very serious in his analysis of the problem. He had a definite plan in his mind's eye.

"I don't care what they preach about," he said, "as long as they interest the public and fill up the pews."

He is a member of a venerable church, which recently "reorganized" and "consolidated" with two others of the same denomi-

nation. I knew they had gone outside their own faith to procure the preacher he had in mind, and I said so.

"Oh, yes," he replied, cheerfully. "He doesn't belong to our church at all. He is not even a member of the regular clerical staff. We called him from the Baptist denomination and he is engaged to preach only once on Sundays. We figured out he measured up best to our specifications, and was far and away the strongest attraction we could locate, so we offered him $12,000 a year flat. And what do you think he did? He was a good sport, all right, and said he had another job that paid him pretty fair, and would come for $2,000 less than we offered if he could keep the other job too. I guess if we had put it up to him strong—same as if we were negotiating for a star salesman, say, in a business organization—we could have got him for $8,000 all right. But we closed at $10,000, and, let me tell you, we never made a better investment. He made a hit the very first Sunday, and our attendance is up to capacity. His reputation helps the night service, too, and we figure we can cut down on some of the extra special music in two or three months and never miss it."

But when I asked my friend what his magnetic pulpiteer preached about, he said: "Oh, that never bothers us. Anything that comes into his head that's strictly up to date. We gave him carte blanche and never know what he will say until we hear him."

I went out into the electric signs and strolled down the Great White Way, where among the determined currents of the amusement seekers I met another friend, and together we went to the movies. I place great reliance upon this man's judgment, and during the barytone solo I asked him what he thought the clergy should preach about. His reply was this:

"Have you asked the clergy?"

I said, "Yes, I have asked two."

"What did they tell you?"

"They did not agree at all. Indeed, they were diametrically opposed in their views."

"Well, then," answered my friend, "why do you ask me when the clergy themselves don't know?"

And there I was, back again where I had started. The truth of the situation dawned upon me. If the question is to be answered at all, it must be answered in terms of my own personal tastes and prejudices. The opinion of the next man is as good as mine, and

the inhabitants of these United States number 110,000,000.

So let us reframe the question to read this way:

"What kind of a sermon would you, a layman, like to listen to?"

I shall do my best to answer it, and be frank about it, and in so doing ask the reader to be patient with me, and interrupt if he feels I am wandering or becoming too personal.

For one thing, I should like to learn more about the nature of what the Prayer Book and the pulpit call sin. It is a little word, three letters long, and like other little words, has been the occasion of millions of longer words, written and spoken, and still, like its great enemy, Truth, when crushed to earth, seems to have the faculty of rising again. Sin seems word and pulpit proof, and I should like to hear and learn more deeply about it.

For example here are some of the questions this layman asks himself:

Is sin constant, or does it vary with the centuries?

Is sin in this country and in this age the same as it was in Rome in Augustus' age?

In a simple age, when men live naturally and peacefully, do they sin less than in a complex century when life is blown to a white heat? And if men sin more in the latter age, are they to be held equally accountable?

And the degrees of sin? How are they fixed and numbered? A man I know told me with tears in his eyes how he had passed by a poor patient horse that had slipped upon the pavement and whose driver did not understand how to raise him to his feet again. My friend had been born among horses and was a lover of them from his earliest boyhood, and he knew how to help the prostrate horse. But something, he said, would not let him help, and he passed by on the other side. He thought a personal devil made him shirk his duty, and I have never seen a man who needed more the consolation of the confessional. He had sinned according to his light, and black was the sin in his own eyes. How would the confessor have handled that man's story? And what was the degree of his sin?

The disciples of New Thought say, "There is no sin," and that is all there is to it for them. I read one of them the penitential prayers out of the Treasury of Devotion. She listened politely. "God does not believe we are sinners," she told me. "He is my father, and loves me, and knows I cannot commit a sin if I follow his laws. The word sin is not in God's vocabulary. Why should it

be in ours? I deny sin." She was rather horrified at the prayers.

You see it is all rather confused in a poor layman's mind. He sees a good hearted brother lying his head off to save a friend from unhappiness, and that is a sin; but is it? For years a man in a little country town hated the church of Christ and the Christian religion because a "Blue Presbyterian" pastor told a mother who had lost two little children in an epidemic that their souls were broiling in hell because they had not been baptized. This man railed against a church that would teach such things and permit a broken hearted mother to be terrified by so dreadful a picture. I think many good people asked, whose was the sin there and who the sinner?

I should like very much to sit beside a clear, good and kindly preacher who would turn the pages of the book of life and tell us what sin is, and how it occurs, and how we can recognize it in these swift and relentless times. And also I should want him to make clear what sins of omission the clergy can commit against their flocks.

Another subject about which I should like to hear simple and clear teaching is the nature and personality of Jesus Christ. For many years, ever since as a little boy I sat watching the June sunshine filter through the dusty windows of a country church, I have wondered how He looked, and spoke, and walked in the Galilean lanes.

A commonplace of psychology is that the human mind loves to transact its business in pictures. The concrete is easy to remember, but our brains conspire to evict an abstraction. They will keep up the struggle until the hazy thing has fled completely or has been mangled beyond recognition. The little girl who came home from Sunday school with a new song about a consecrated cross-eyed bear ran true to form, and the clergy would feel a shock of surprise at inspecting an inventory of their congregation's minds after an hour of controversial theology. But tell them how our Lord looked, and what He did and said upon the mountain's slope, and they will carry away the picture as a treasure.

What is the popular conception of Christ as a person? This question asked of a group of church people will bring forth vague and incoherent replies. Some will describe the typical figure that the medieval artists standardized, and surely those painters had

much to answer for. Perhaps it is a dissatisfaction with this portraiture of Christ that aroused a longing to see and hear Him pictured as a man, but more than a man. A task for the greatest of artists, yet only a little while ago one short sentence in an editorial in this magazine lighted up my blindness and I saw the Christ of my dreams. The words occurred in a paragraph of the February number, and they are as sharply defined now as if I had but just seen them. The sentence read: "Christ was Man, not a man." I came nearer to understanding Him then than ever before. He must have felt and looked like you and me, for He was and is you and I, and His life is the epitome of our lives from the cradle to the grave. The little sentence of six one-syllable words was for me a vivid sermon that penetrated to the roots of life.

The history of the Church is another source for sermons that seems overlooked and underestimated. There may be a good reason for it, and quite probably is, for rarely do we hear a word from the pulpit that touches upon the story of our Catholic past. And to this layman such an omission seems a mistake. Mr. Wells and Mr. Van Loon have recently proved that not only can history be taken down from the shelves and dusted, but can be refinished and polished up to such an attractive degree of glitter that what we supposed was scrap metal becomes a best seller in the market place.

The success of Mr. Wells' "Outlines" is not phenomenal at all. It was as natural a thing as that a group of children will nestle about an open fire on a winter night and listen breathless to a teller of tales. Mr. Wells figured his plans skillfully and based them upon the immemorial truth that Homer is always young. He is a shrewd and able business man, and, if we may be permitted to use the phrase of the day, he "put one over," even if his methods were unfair and his facts distorted. To make a best seller out of the history of this disabled planet is a feat that will bring a smile of recognition to the lips of Herodotus' shade in the vales of that Avernus which Mr. Wells denies.

And all this shows that history is not dull, nor dense, but full of life and action and meaning to men and women who are living and striving and wondering through the world. During Lent in a little ancient red brick church in Hudson street a preacher told us on Sunday nights the story of the Saints of the Church—

the Holy Fathers who kept the faith alive through the flames and darkness of the early centuries. He recounted their lives and acts in terms of today, and the years vanished and we saw Carthage and the death of the brave old bishop in the public square. St. Ignatius, who knew and spoke with St. John in his old age, became a living figure, and St. Augustine wrote for us his golden book.

No one in the congregation nodded, nor whispered, nor shuffled. They sat by the fire and listened to a teller of tales, and went away with a deeper faith and a warmer love in their hearts for our Mother Church who has borne such sons.

Yes, I should like to hear sermons on the subjects I have sketched, but to read over these pages brings a smile and a shake of the head. How easy to sit at a desk and dictate to the clergy how they should preach—and to whom? In the next apartment lives a man who produces plays. My neighbor at lunch designs and distributes souvenir postcards. My stenographer considers the movies fixed feasts and is a who's who of famous players. Will my tastes in sermons meet theirs? Will they approve of my topics?

Alas, the poor clergy! They will not. This is a complex age and only when the flame of fear lights up the home horizons will the people listen as one man to the preaching of a crusade. Bernard of Clairvaux had a united church and an undivided Christendom to hear him and crusades were not so hard to sell in those simple times. Today but one church can send forth a fiery cross and know the clans will gather. Ours cannot do it. And still I have wondered what might happen if during one Lent our Church, united in her purpose, should preach Christ Crucified, and that alone, to her people for the forty days.

Christ crucified, today. Not two thousand years ago. But today, here, in our own homes, on our streets, wherever men meet and pass and greet one another. What would happen?

The Mystery Religions and Christianity

Rev. William Philip Downes

I. The Mysteries.

THE heeding of the cry "Back to Jesus" has resulted at least in an exploration, to an extent hitherto unachieved, of the environment out of which Christianity arose. The Jewish background naturally first attracted the attention of scholars, and the momentous works of Schürer, M. Friedländer, Bousset, Kautzsch and Charles afford a knowledge of the inner-testament period that is indispensable for an understanding of the Jewish side of our religion. Not the less essential is it, however, in order to comprehend the magnitude, the difficulty, and the complexity of the task of nascent Christianity, that one should be critically informed as to the moral, religious, political and philosophical movements of the Gentile *milieu* with which she came in contact.[1]

Christianity entered the Graeco-Roman world at a time when it was seething with religious interest. In fact, from, say, 325 B. C. to 325 A. D. the pagan world experienced the profoundest religious awakening in its history. Of this spiritual revival the two most important factors were neo-platonism and the mystery religions. More and more the past was glorified: *vetustas adoranda est;* in antiquity, dim and mysterious, was the golden age: there was to be found the ripest wisdom and the purest religion; and, consequently, the Orient, had, to the imagination of the time, an extraordinary charm. Thus, in the period of the Roman Empire, immediately preceding and following the rise of Christianity, the Oriental religions found an increasing hospitality: from Phrygia came the cult of Cybele and Attis; from Egypt, the cult of Isis and Serapsis; and from Persia, the cult of Mithra.

It is admitted that our sources for a knowledge of the mysteries are scanty. They consist, for the most part, of Apuleius' "*Metamorphoses*"; Plutarch's treatise "On Isis and Osiris"; the so-called Hermetic literature; and scattered references in classical

[1]For a knowledge of the currents of thought of Graeco-Roman paganism the reader is referred to: Paul Wendland, "*Hellenistisch-Römisch Kultur*"; Boissier, "*La Religion romain d' Auguste aux Antonins*"; S. Dill, "Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius"; T. R. Glover, "Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire"; and Charles Bigg, "The Church's Task Under the Roman Empire."

literature and in the church fathers. Dieterich's *"Eine Mithras-Liturgie,"* though it may not be a genuine Mithra liturgy, is yet a valuable document. Based upon the sources modern scholars have given us as intelligible an exposition of the content and aim of the mysteries as we shall probably ever possess.[2]

The mysteries differ in detail, but they all exhibit certain fundamental traits. That is, a mystery was a rite in which certain "sacra" were exhibited to the worshipper after he had undergone specific purification. Precisely what these "sacra" were has never been divulged. They constituted the "secret" character, the *fides silentii* object, of the mysteries. The cults, in other words, were "mysterious" not because they conveyed occult knowledge, for that which they taught was known to all, but because the "sacra" produced an ineffable religious-psychological experience. Aristotle said that "the initiates of Eleusis learned nothing but experienced certain impressions and were brought to a certain state of soul."

A mystery consisted of three parts: the initiation, the sacrifice and the scenic representation of the great facts of the natural life and of human life, of which the mythical histories of the gods were themselves the symbols. First, there was the *katharsis*—the necessary preliminary stage of purification, by washings, fastings, and the offering of sacrifices. Next, there was the actual initiation or consecration—the rite of *telete* or *muesis*. Here occurred certain acts of eating and drinking; and the giving of the *symbola*, the secret formula or password. Thirdly, usually a year after the preliminary initiation, the consecration proper, the *epopteia*, took place. This consisted of a dramatic representation of the legend or myth of the cult-god, Dionysos, Isis or Mithra, for example. In this final stage the sacra were shown to one's ecstatic contemplation; one became "filled with god," metamorphosized, mystically united with the god, deified.

The chief dignitary of the mysteries was the *hierophant*, "the

---

[2]Fundamental books to consult are: G. Anrich, *"Das Antike Mysterienwesen"*; R. Reitzenstein, *"Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen"*; *Poimandres;* A. Loisy, *"Lès Mystères Païens et Le Mystère Chrétien"*; F. Cumont, "Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism"; "The Mysteries of Mithra"; L. R. Farrell, "Cults of the Greek States"; Frazer, "Attis and Osiris"; C. H. Moore, "Religious Thought of the Greeks."

shower of sacred things." He was the grand initiator and he possessed a strong and even voice. Then there were the torch-bearers and the *hierokeryx,* who made the necessary proclamations. The neophyte had his *mystagogue,* who was not an initiate, but who gave to the candidate the necessary instructions which he must observe preliminary to the initiation.

"The economy of the mysteries," Loisy (*op. cit.* p. 63) says, "comprised two parts: one of trial and sorrow, even of agony, which took place in the darkness; the other, that of consolation and joy, which took place in the full light and in the society of the gods and their friends, the initiates." Suffering and joy, as they are the notes of all mystic life, so they constituted the totality of the liturgical drama of the mysteries and of the inward experience of the mystes.

The Hellenistic Greek-Oriental mystery religions were originally national or state religions, which, at the time when state religions everywhere had collapsed, were transported into the Roman Empire, and, by a process which is obscure to us, became "mysteries," that is, secret religions of redemption. Whereas the *religio civilis,* the "established" religion was wholly social and unmystical and one became a member of it by birth; the mystery religions were personal, and their adepts believed themselves called to become initiated in them. If in the Diaspora, the Roman Empire, these religions became denationalized, they became also individualized, universalized, democratized, recruiting their devotees from all ranks of society.

The mysteries were vigorously missionary religions; they inculcated piety of heart; and they professed to provide a way of escape from the ills of this life and to guarantee a blissful immortality in the life beyond. This salvation (*soteria, salus*) was believed to be effected by means of sacraments that worked *ex opere operato.* He that had experienced the taurobolium, the blood-bath, for example, was said to be born again unto everlasting life: *"taurobolio criobolioque in aeternum renatus".* An initiate was believed to have received a character *indelebilis;* he was said to have become *sacratus, renatus, tauroboliatus.* In the so-called Mithra liturgy the initiate says at the end of the service:

"O Lord, I have been born again, and depart that I may grow, and having grown I die; through birth that gives life I have been

born, and I go to be released in death, as thou hast ordained and instituted in the sacrament".[3]

Purification and salvation through regeneration are the two supreme notes of the mysteries. These cults were tolerant of each other and one became initiated in as many as one elected. They were syncretistic and they stood for a sort of monotheism, in that the same god was believed to be worshipped under various names.

Of the dissemination of the mystery cults Prof. W. H. P. Hatch writes: "The mystery cults enjoyed great popularity throughout the length and breadth of the Roman Empire, and some of them continued to attract worshippers even after Christianity had triumphed over paganism. They had multitudes of adherents both in the cities and in the country districts. Soldiers and merchants, government officials and slaves were continually passing to and fro on their business or settling down on the approach of old age to pass their remaining days in peace and quiet. Many of them were votaries of the Oriental divinities, and wherever they went a shrine was almost sure to be set up and a centre of influence established."[4] Says Cumont, "Cybele and Attis, Isis and Serapsis, the Syrian Baals, Sabazius and Mithra were honored by brotherhoods of believers as far as the remotest limits of Germany".[5]

Why did these religions of foreign provenance spread throughout the Roman Empire and enjoy so great a vitality there for several centuries? Cumont most lucidly answers this question when he says that a great religious conquest can be explained only on moral grounds, that is, in the last analysis, by a series of individual conversions. Thus the consecration to any cult god, Isis or Mithra, was the result of a call "to enlist in a sacred militia". He specifically states that the mystery religions succeeded because they gave greater satisfaction to the senses, to the intellect, and to the conscience than did the state religion or philosophy.[6]

The Roman religion was proverbially cold, prosaic, subor-

---

[3]Translated by Prof. Lake, "Stewardship of Faith," p. 84.

[4]"The Pauline Idea of Faith," p. 71.

[5]"Oriental Religions," p. 22.

[6]Op. cit. chap. II, entire.

dinated to politics and suspicious of emotion. The cults appealed to the heart and the spiritual imagination; they inculcated the art of devotional worship. In contrast to speculative philosophy, they professed to possess a direct, divine revelation; and they awakened the mystic intuition. They stressed inward purity. Their clergy were not state officials but spiritual directors of souls. Among the devotees of Isis, Cybele and Mithra there was a fellowship that no state religion could arouse. But above all, into an age growing increasingly pessimistic and hopeless the mysteries introduced a spirit of joy by professing to give a foretaste of immortality, here, and to guarantee its complete realization, hereafter. Thus they responded to man's longing for redemption from fate and for union with the divine.

The question naturally arises: what was the permanent moral and religious influence of the mysteries? Scholars have differed in their answer. The tendency today is to ascribe to the mysteries, on the whole, a relatively high moral and religious value. Says Prof. Lake: "They were genuinely religious. On the ethical side they were weak, but they strove to attain that experience of union with a higher reality which is central in religion. . . to the initiate all became touched with sacramental splendor."[7]

If it is true that not all who attended the ceremonies grasped the meaning of that which they saw and heard, or, as Plato said, "many are the thrysus-bearers, few are the mystes"; the same criticism may be made of the adherents of any religion. The opinion of Cumont, a very great authority, should be convincing. "Compared", he says, "with the ancient creeds, they appear to have offered greater beauty of ritual, greater truth of doctrine, and a far superior morality."[8] Again, "through a sudden illumination they furnished the intuition of a spiritual life whose intensity made all material happiness appear insipid and contemptible. This stirring appeal of supernatural life made the propaganda irresistible".[9] Years ago Dr. Edwin Hatch writing of the mysteries said that "the race of mankind was lifted on to a higher plane when it came to be taught that only the pure in heart can see God".

---

[7]op. cit. p. 82.
[8]op. cit. p. XXIV.
[9]op. cit. p. 44.

The mystery religions were the most persistent and the most powerful religious competitors that Christianity encountered, for neither state religion nor Judaism was ever a serious rival. Renan said that "if Christianity had been arrested in its progress by any mortal defect, the world would have been Mithraized". Of all the Oriental cults Mithra was the most elevated spiritually and the purest morally. Why did the cults disappear and Christianity succeed to a position of supremacy?

II. The Relationship.

The relationship of primitive Christianity to the Hellenistic Greek-Oriental mystery religions is one of the "burning" questions of New Testament criticism today. It is, however, far from possessing only an academic or antiquarian interest. It involves, in fact, nothing less significant than the question of the origin and primitive character of our religion. Those to whom the origin of Christianity is of no practical importance are, we know, those to whom the prophetic and the social motives predominate over the mystical, the personal and the sacramental. This is the reason why, as Prof. Bacon has recently acutely pointed out, they wish to ignore "the theologizing gospel of Paul, resenting his emphasis upon personal redemption and the life of the individual soul 'in God' ".[10]

Hence has risen in recent years the great so-called "Jesus and Paul" controversy—it being evident that the point of departure for the interpretation of the person of our Lord must be the testimony of the great apostle. "Explain", says Prof. Machen, "the origin of the religion of Paul, and you have solved the problem of the origin of Christianity".[11] It is indeed true that the only way by which one can make Christianity consist mainly in "the monotheistic humanitarianism of the prophets stripped of its temporal and racial limitations" is by the arbitrary elimination of St. Paul. For to him Christianity is personal, redemptive, mystical, sacramental. To him Christ is Lord, the object of faith and of worship—the Savior. St. Paul's religion is admittedly a religion *about* Christ. It is concerned with regeneration, the mystical life in God through Christ, and with a thorough-going sacramentalism (so concede Gunkel, Bousset, Heitmüller, Loisy, Lake, and the

[10]B. W. Bacon, "Jesus and Paul", p. 56.
[11]J. G. Machen, "Origin of Paul's Religion", p. 4.

radical school in general). The controversy rages about the question whether the apostle transformed, as it is alleged, "the social, unmystical religion *of* Jesus into the personal, mystical, sacramental religion *about* Jesus."

Obviously Catholic Christians do not believe that St. Paul was the founder, whether the first or the second, or the transformer, of Christianity. The "gospel" is the message—the *heilbotschaft*—that Jesus is the Christ, the Incarnate Son of God. This is the message that St. Paul "received" and delivered, though in the exposition of the message, guided by the Holy Spirit, he did bring into play all the wealth of his capacious intellect. So we accept that which the apostle affirms about our Lord at its face value.

But criticism is today much pre-occupied with attempts to explain the apostle's religion on purely natural grounds. There is the "liberal Protestant" school—a school that has lost, in the critical world, most of the great prestige it enjoyed for many years—which believes that our Lord did not ask men to take Him as an object of faith, but simply as an example of conduct; and to have the like faith in God that He had. It believes we should separate St. Paul's religion from his theology: we may throw the apostle's theology away but retain his religion, which was just the "liberal" religion of Jesus.

The radical school, Bousset, Heitmüller, Loisy and Lake, for example—vigorously attacks this position of the liberals. It works according to the religio-historical method. Thus it believes it can explain Christianity as the natural result of a syncretistic process: it is a combination of Jewish apocalyptic religion and pagan religion as represented by the mysteries; and by a deft application of the method of comparative religion it professes to explain Paulinism. Such books as Bousset's "*Kyrios Christos*", Heitmüller's "*Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus*", Morgan's "Religion and Theology of Paul", are representative of the radical school and are epoch-making in the history of N. T. criticism, and they have left the liberal criticism of even fifteen years ago high and dry. The radicals do not tolerate the position that St. Paul was a follower of the "liberal Jesus"—the genial Jewish rabbi who would lead mankind to a liberalized Jewish God. The apostle, they maintain, was passionately interested in a religion of redemption, in Jesus Christ, who as a Savior-God, would give to mankind the gift of immortality by the sacraments.

The radicals seek to construe this redemption, sacramental conception of Christianity, this, obviously, only valid Paulinism, mainly by referring to the apostle's Hellenistic training. It is affirmed that at Tarsus he must have come into the atmosphere of the mystery religions and from them learned the informing principles of his theology; and that he must have been aware that in paganism the mysteries alone satisfied the longing of the age for personal religion and for redemption. Further it is maintained that the apostle was converted not to the Christianity of Jerusalem but to that of Damascus and Antioch which, it is said, early contained pagan elements. The Christians of these places had transferred to Jesus the attributes of the cult-gods. Thus Jesus became a cult-god like the pagan cult-gods, and Christianity became, in important respects, like the pagan, redemptive cults. In short, these fundamental elements are said to have been taken over from the Graeco-Roman syncretism into Christianity: first, the complex of ideas connected with salvation; secondly, the sacraments; and thirdly, the Christology and the work of Christ in redemption.[12] This work, it is said, was, if not begun, at least greatly fostered by St. Paul.

As a convincing proof of the influence of the mysteries upon the apostle, scholars have pointed out his frequent use of the mystery terms and ideas—the *termini technici* of the mysteries—as for example (1 Cor. 11. 6ff) "perfect", "mystery"; his familiar antithesis of "flesh and spirit"; his use of the word "knowledge" and many others.[13]

How is a practical, intelligent Christian to regard this exceedingly interesting and vitally important subject of the relationship of the mysteries to primitive Christianity? As scholars are becoming increasingly pre-occupied with the subject and all the lat-

---

[12]Machen, op. cit. p. 262.

[13]Though very conservative, Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy's "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions", chap. IV., should be consulted for its examination of St. Paul's termonology.

The leading critics who deny that St. Paul was influenced in his central ideas by the mysteries are: Dr. Kennedy; Clemen, "Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources"; *"Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf alteste Christenten"*; Anrich, *"Das Antike Mysterienwesen"*; Machen, "Origin of Paul's Religion"; Allo, *"L'Evangile en Face du Syncretisme Paien"*. On the other side, we have: Bousset, *"Kyrios Christos"*; Reitzenstein, *"Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen"*; Loisy, *"Les Mystères Paiens"*; Lake, "Stewardship," "Landmarks," etc.; Morgan, "Religion and Theology of Paul"; Bacon, "Jesus and Paul".

est books treating the N. T. critically are giving to it a large consideration, orthodox Christians must be prepared to meet the situation apologetically. The writer ventures to present the following suggestions. Both Lake and Loisy strongly affirm that Christianity entered the Gentile world as a "mystery religion." Loisy says "the world did not want to become Jew." The world was looking for salvation. This longing, we believe, was not an evidence of weakness or decadence, but the healthy, normal craving of the soul. In the providence of God the mystery religions acted as a positive element in the *preparatio evangelica*—probably the most important element in the pagan world. These cults endeavored to meet an actual religious-psychological demand. The time, I believe, has come when we must more generously recognize the extraordinary value of this pagan preparation. Says St. Augustine, "That which we call the Christian religion existed among the ancients, from the beginning of the human race, until Christ came in the flesh, at which time the true religion which already existed, began to be called Christianity". Says Dean Inge, "A doctrine is not necessarily un-Christian because it is Greek or pagan. I know of no greater perversity than . . . to suppose that our Lord meant to raise an universal religion on a purely Jewish basis".[14] Prejudice against a thing simply because it is "pagan" is both provincial and unscientific.

Secondly, as to the apostle's use of the mystery vocabulary. It is for the scientific philogist to determine whether he did or did not employ the mystery categories. Few critics believe that he slavishly borrowed his leading ideas from the mysteries. Readily it may be conceded that he made frequent use of the mystery terms. This was natural; they were in the air; they were the familiar religious idiom of the day, in the pagan world. If, however, he employed them, it is generally admitted, by the grace of God, he transformed them by his great genius, giving to them a vaster meaning, both morally and religiously. That a man of the apostle's creative power tamely transferred the mystery ideas to the Christian religion is inconceivable. His use of the terms may well have been "a point of contact" with his pagan hearers; he may have used them as freely as we use such terms as "evolution", "heredity", "variations"—that is in a more or less popular way.

[14] "Christian Mysticism", p. 350.

Wendland suggests that the mystery terms yielded the apostle effective forms of expression. This may be granted. Scholarship has not succeeded in demonstrating that the apostle obtained his ideas of regeneration, resurrection, mystical union, forgiveness, faith, his sacramentalism, from the mysteries. St. Paul spoke out of personal experience, whatever terms he may have employed to express it.

Thirdy, nothing is more amazing than the gradual dying out, during the last ten or fifteen years, of the once all-powerful, unmystical liberal-protestant school of N. T. criticism, of which Harnack's *"Das Wesen des Christentums"* may be taken as the confident manifesto (and swan-song). The radical and the traditional schools have the field today. So far as the intellectuals in theology are concerned liberal Protestantism is antique, or dead. It is true that scores of ministers, and some priests, are unaware of this fact. It is becoming increasingly the case for radical critics—critics like Heitmüller, Bousset and Lake, for example—to agree with Catholicism as to the facts of primitive Christianity —to admit that Catholicism is primitive, in its essential elements, and not the product of a degeneracy of later centuries. The liberal-protestant myth of the post-apostolic degeneracy of Christianity has been given up by all reputable scholarship. Radical criticism is strongly on the Catholic side in its findings. Catholic and radical differ mainly in the explanation of the facts. The Catholic believes that his religion is supernaturally revealed, to whatever extent it may have been prepared for by Jewish or pagan religion. The radical endeavors to account for the obvious Catholic quality of the N. T. on purely naturalistic grounds—as a syncretism of elements that were in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman environment. Logically, the issue is clearly drawn: if one believes that the N. T. contains a supernatural revelation, he must accept the Catholic religion of the Church. If on the other hand, one cannot believe in the supernatural at all, it will be exceedingly difficult to get out of the N. T. any religion that has a scientifically intelligible meaning. The evasive, compromising, nebulous patchwork construction known as liberal protestantism—merely the projection of "modern" thought into primitive Christianity—must, with the progress of true scientific interpretation, appeal less and less to intelligent men. One must be either a naturalist or a supernaturalist. The study of the mysteries has been a pow-

erful factor in demonstrating the Catholic character of Christianity at its birth. The mystical and redemptive side of Christianity was made ready for, largely, by pagan thought—the Jew was ethical but unmystical. All attempts to discover in the O. T. anything more than the slightest suggestions of genuine mysticism have failed.

Finally, Christianity conquered in the past as a redemptive, incarnational, mystical religion. In a large sense she came into the world as a "mystery religion"—as the mystery *par excellence*. She did not borrow her ideas from the pagan mysteries, though she may have used the mystery termonology, as a literary vehicle. Both the mysteries and Christianity worked in the same *milieu* and had to meet the same religious-psychological conditions. The greatest resistance that Christianity encountered was from the mysteries. She vanquished them, not because she was a purely moral system, but because she proved to be a better, diviner, purer, more ethical, mystery. In type, she was not unlike them. In content—the revelation of the incarnate Son of God—little comparison is possible.

Our religion is not the happy or unhappy result of a naturalistic syncretism. The Catholic religion—Christianity, may be said to be a grand synthesis—Christ summing up all things in Himself, "a synthesis by way of the inclusive deity of Christ", and attained by the supernatural working of God. Father Allo well puts it: "Christianity is not a syncretism but a synthesis; a synthesis which would never have been made without the action of an element absolutely new, of a knowledge which was not the result of previous religious systems but which was presented from without, from on high, to the human intelligence. This element was a fact, independent in its existence of the thought of humanity, and transcending its dream and any historic determinism".[15]

In his interesting and learned book just published the Rev. Dr. John Glasse (a Presbyterian), referring to the recent study of the mysteries, says: "It has thoroughly undermined the position of (liberal) Protestants. It is the sacramentarians who are really in closest harmony with the teaching of the New Testament, and they are entitled to claim it.".* Again, "One is apt to forget that lib-

[15]B. Allo, O. P. *"L' vangile en face du Syncrétisme paien"*, p. 166.
*"The Mysteries and Christianity", John Glasse, D.D., p. 159.

eral Protestantism is an anachronism as a representation of early Christianity. Jesus was not a cultured gentleman with modernist ideas".*

The Lord's Service for the Lord's Day

Rev. Hamilton Schuyler

TO restore the Holy Eucharist to its honored place as the main service for each Lord's Day is no innovation, but rather simply a reversion to the fundamental principles of Christian worship. To substitute for this service something else is a modern expedient wholly at variance with the age-long custom of the universal Church. From Apostolic times onwards in all parts of the Catholic Church, East and West, the Holy Eucharist has always been the one service of obligation to Christians, the only exception to the rule being found in the Anglican Communion when following the period of the Reformation the custom fell into abeyance owing to ecclesiastical slackness and the efforts of the Puritan faction in the Church to decatholicise its practice. But though it was possible to effect a change in the habits of the people, the Book of Common Prayer remained as an abiding witness to the Church's ideal. In that Book the Catholic standard of worship remained unimpaired namely in the direct provision which it makes for the observance of the Holy Communion as the chief service on every Lord's Day and Holy Day throughout the year. Morning and evening prayer were appointed to be used as daily offices with the implication that such would be said also on Sundays in conjunction with the Holy Communion.

Dean Luckock, one of the great liturgical scholars in the English Church, in speaking of the custom of infrequent celebrations of the Holy Eucharist which had grown up during the lax period following the Reformation has this to say: "It was not till the Catholic revival of 1833 that the English Church awoke to her duty of offering a communion on every day for which her Prayer Book provides an appointed service." Referring to the monthly Communion as being regarded as sufficient, he says: "This is a purely arbitrary practice based upon no substantial principle or

*op. cit. p. 160.

recognized authority. But it is altogether different when a Sunday or Festival Communion is adopted. This rule rests on the teaching and usage of the purest ages of the Church's history and it brings our practice up to a level with the standard enforced by the provisions of our service books."

The Rev. Dr. Percy Dearmer, a conservative authority, who has written extensively upon the subject of worship, has this to say upon the disposition to regard an early celebration as a sufficient compliance with the ideal of the Prayer Book. "The practice of having additional celebrations at early hours for the convenience of different classes of communicants is amply justified by the resulting increase in the number of Communions. But it must be remembered that they are *additional* services and must not be allowed to supplant the principal Eucharist; to have a celebration at 8 followed only by Matins, Sermon and Litany is certainly a use not contemplated by the Prayer Book."

The Anglican Communion to which the Episcopal Church in this country belongs claims to be a true portion of the Catholic body. It holds the Catholic faith as set forth in the historic creeds. It possesses the Three-fold Order of the Apostolic Ministry. It observes the sacraments of Christ's appointing. The Book of Common Prayer, the standard of Anglican doctrine and worship is a Catholic document. The office for the celebration of the Holy Communion is in full accord with the principles of the ancient liturgies. By every test the Anglican Communion is Catholic in its standards and its ideals. It is only in some of its practices, in the temper and disposition of its people that it can be charged with a leaning towards Protestantism. That many of its people should be Protestant rather than Catholic in their conceptions of the Church and in their reluctance to accept Catholic teaching and traditions is not strange. The Reformation, while it wrought much good for which we must be thankful, also introduced an iconoclastic spirit which is the antithesis of the spirit of Catholic conservatism. Dislike and fear of Rome and hence repugnance to its customs and practices, good as well as bad, were naturally engendered as the result of the Reformation and have prevailed down to the present day. Considering the course of history this prejudice is not greatly to be wondered at. It may be that such a sentiment has had some justification in the past. But the point I would make is that it is necessary to dis-

criminate. What we really object to in the Roman Church is not its Catholicism, but its Romanism. It is the evils of Papalism and Vaticanism which we repudiate and not the preservation by Rome of those Catholic principles which we share with her as likewise with the Orthodox Church of the East.

If in the past we have suffered ourselves to neglect or disparage certain doctrines and practices which in themselves are good and in strict accord with Apostolic Christianity there is no reason why we should forever continue to do so simply because our ancestors fell into lax ways. What we ought to be ready and glad to do is to recover our lost Catholic heritage, to take and use what is rightfully ours and what as a Church we have never wilfully abrogated.

One of these Catholic practices and perhaps the one most essential to Christian devotion which we ought now to restore to its proper place in the Church's life is the Holy Eucharist as the main service for every Lord's Day. This is primitive, scriptural, Apostolic, and not merely a following of a Latin or Greek custom. If the Episcopal Church is inherently a portion of the Catholic body, then to refrain from such an universal custom would be a serious reflection upon its Catholicity. To substitute for this service something else, however otherwise edifying and popular, is to that extent to nullify our claims.

Whatever auxiliary services may have been developed in the Church for the use of the clergy and those pledged to a life of strict devotion in religious establishments, the Eucharist always had the place of honor. On every Sunday and Holy Day the whole body of the faithful, clergy and laity alike, united to participate in this service. The celebration of the Eucharist was regarded as the great corporate act of the Christian congregation, the symbol of the unity of its members in the one Body and the highest expression of its devotion to Christ. Attendance at this service on Sundays was required of all who were not excommunicated, as it still is today both in the Latin and Greek Communions. To relegate this great service to an early hour in the morning, when it is only possible for a few to be present, is to fail to meet the ideal which is to afford all an opportunity to perform their high Christian duty. Morning Prayer and the Litany were never intended to be substitutes for the Eucharist, but rather were designed to furnish a preparation for it. The

ideal order for every Sunday would perhaps be to say Morning Prayer and the Litany, immediately following with the Communion Office; but in these degenerate days this is asking too much of the average worshipper, who objects to remaining in church for so long a period. If anything is to be sacrificed it surely ought not to be the Eucharist, for this is the only service directly commanded by Christ Himself in the words "Do this in remembrance of Me," words which the Church has always interpreted as signifying a continuing memorial at least on every Lord's Day.

It was the custom of the first Christians to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice daily, but this gave way after the Pentecostal era to its observance on the first day of each week as being the weekly recurring memorial of Christ's Resurrection, the Lord's Day as it came to be called. An early ecclesiastical rule made it incumbent upon the clergy to offer the Holy Sacrifice daily, as is still the case with priests of the Latin though not of the Greek Church, and is perhaps implied in a rubric of our own Prayer Book which directs that the Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the Sunday shall serve for the rest of the week.

The obligation as far as the laity is concerned is to assist by their presence and devotions in this act of corporate worship. The officiant has his part and the people have theirs. Apart from the congregation the service would lose its character. It is not permitted to a priest to celebrate without at least one other person being in attendance. This rule is in accordance with the promise of Christ, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." The officiating priest must himself always receive the Sacrament as essential to the integrity of the rite, but it is not necessary that the people or all of them should do so, though a rubric in our Prayer Book seems to require that at least two beside the officiant should communicate.

Undoubtedly among the Pentecostal Christians in their zeal and earnestness all who were present at the service would communicate, but as time went on and the Church began to take in a varied multitude the custom that all should receive every time they were present was felt to make too great a demand upon devotion and only those came forward who had specifically prepared themselves. All were urged to communicate who were re-

ligiously and devoutly disposed to do so, but it was not expected that the whole congregation present should do so. Communicants were urged rather to prepare themselves to receive at certain definite times, weekly or monthly as they were spiritually disposed, but in any event at all the greater feasts of the Church, such as Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Whitsunday and Ascension Day or during their octaves. The rubric in the English Prayer Book gives the bare minimum as "three times in the year, of which Easter shall be one." The Church welcomes to its altar weekly and at all times those who can comply with the conditions as set forth in the invitation, "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins and are in love and charity with your neighbors and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God and walking from henceforth in His holy ways." As there is a hearty invitation for all such, so there is no criticism of those who may not feel minded to come forward so often, but who conscientiously reserve making their communion at less frequent intervals. But whether a communion be made weekly or not the obligation remains to be present in the place of Christian assembly on every Lord's Day to participate in the Eucharistic worship, to hear the instructions of the preacher and to join with their brethren in the customary offering.

In the Eucharist, Christ vouchsafes to reveal Himself to us in a special and unique way. He is, of course, present with us spiritually at all times by virtue of His Godhead, but He is present in the Eucharist after a sacramental and intimate fashion, His very Body and Blood, these elements which represent His glorified humanity, being present on the altar under the veils of the consecrated Bread and Wine.

We Christians worship no God remote from His creation, but One incarnate in the likeness of our flesh, One with the Father in all the attributes of deity and also One with ourselves in the possession of a common human nature. In other words we worship God in Jesus Christ who is the divine-human mediator through whom alone we can offer an acceptable sacrifice to the Majesty on high. The Eucharistic offering is made to the Father through the Son. The familiar Eucharistic hymn well expresses this truth:

And now, O Father, mindful of the love
That bought us once for all on Calvary's tree
And having with us Him that pleads above
We here present, we hear spread forth to Thee
That only offering perfect in thine eyes,
The one true, pure immortal sacrifice.

Christians can always worship at the Eucharist, though they may not at that special time receive the sacrament. They can unite with their brethren in offering the great memorial and they will surely receive a blessing by participating in that corporate act. It is their unspeakable privilege to unite "with angels and archangels and with the whole company of heaven" in wondering adoration of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity. This is the climax of Christian worship where men forget themselves in contemplation of the glory of the triune God.

To those who have become accustomed to this service, nothing else can ever take its place and such would not willingly miss the privilege which the celebration of the Eucharist on every Lord's Day and Holy Day affords. To devout souls trained to participate in this service it is always wonderful, a foretaste indeed of the worship of heaven. Doubtless training is required, for real worship is an art that demands concentration of the spiritual energies. Yet, on the other hand, the Eucharistic service is the simplest of all our services, for it is an objective act of worship and not only a devotional exercise. Under easily understood symbolism the great truths of Redemption are set forth for human faith and apprehension. Everyone, even the humblest and least intelligent, can participate, for in this service there is something *done* and not something merely *said*. "Do this in remembrance of Me" is the direct command of Christ, and it is possible for all to obey, even for a child.

In exalting the Eucharist and claiming for it the chief place in Christian worship there is no intention to disparage the daily offices or the Litany. These are edifying and beautiful services, endeared to us by use and old association. They ought not habitually to be disused, and they are not in this Church. Still the fact remains that these services should not usurp the place which rightfully belongs to the Eucharist as the main service of obligation for every Lord's Day. Morning and Evening Prayer, the

daily offices, are derived from the monastic services of the "Hours" and can properly be recited in the privacy of the home or by groups when a priest is not available. They were intended, as I have previously said, to be supplementary to the Eucharist and never as substitutes for it.

There are people in the Church who prefer to have Morning Prayer and the Litany as the ordinary Sunday services, with the Holy Eucharist substituted for such on one Sunday only in each month. To have the Eucharist as the main service every Sunday morning they regard as an innovation, a change of the habits of a lifetime. These persons are among our most devoted and most loyal Church people, and I beg them to believe that I am not unappreciative of their point of view. Most rectors would gladly yield to the wishes of these good people if it were a mere matter of personal preference on their part or that of others whom they are also bound to consider. Ritual and ceremonial beyond the obligation to do everything "decently and in order," are not of vital importance. Many clergy are content for themselves and for their congregations to order the services along the traditional lines of the Anglican Communion, but they know that the best and oldest traditions are not those which have grown up during the lax days succeeding the Reformation. They prefer to return to the best standards and to teach and practice what is certainly Catholic and Apostolic. As religious leaders, they must lead and not hesitate to do that which their conscience and knowledge tell them is right and proper. To do otherwise would be to abandon their ideals and merit self-condemnation.

No change will ever be welcomed by every one, but if the change is in the right direction, if it is a restoration of what can be demonstrated to be in accord with the unvarying custom of the whole Catholic Church and with the genius of the Book of Common Prayer, then the clergy should be prepared to take full responsibility for this action; indeed they must take it, for the Church definitely imposes it upon them.

Gnats, Camels and the Point of Perspective

THE CENSOR

SOME of us seem to have a gift of stressing wrong values. The trouble probably lies with our "complexes," which (or who) appear to have a finger in everything—if we are to believe current psychology. Be that as it may, there are certainly strange points of perspective abroad which tend to overthrow the equilibrium of some of us who were brought up in old-fashioned three-dimensional days.

Of course there are non-important instances where the metaphysical accent may be placed, just as the audible one in the pronunciation of your name—that is, where you please. But are there not categories where the mistake of a gnat for a camel (to introduce the figure of our caption) may cause inconvenience, if not something far more disastrous?

Of the comparatively unimportant kind was the reading of a certain cleric, who, endowed by saving grace, with a good voice and enunciation, robustly emphasized all non-important words in the Church service, thereby deleting the subject matter of much meaning. The case is a parable, with wide-reaching, and graver, applications. We can all make many of them.

The tritest, of course, is the undue stress laid by our generation upon pleasure and excitement. The overexertion of an early service or a weekly fast must be strained out rigorously, while the camels of unlimited "movies," motorings and midnight feasting (the metaphor here tends to become literal) may be freely swallowed. Of course the fault is in a wrong appreciation of values. Responsibility and duty have become debased coinage, and seem still to be shrinking. In our day, the Cavalier has long been revenged on the Puritan. There are "cakes and ale" (or more dangerous equivalents) in plenty now, and "ginger" which we may paraphrase as moral "jazz" has long been "hot in the mouth."

Another, perhaps as obvious, instance of a changed perspective may be found in the point of manners. Certainly, if "manners maketh man" (according to the well-accepted dictum of William of Wykeham), some of our present-day products, of both

sexes, appear rather ill-made. Can it be that we are so busy stressing self-expression, self-development, self-suggestion, that we do not note that we are straining out much of really fine punctiliousness, as well as the worthy shame-facedness which belonged as a matter of course to our grandfathers and supremely to our grandmothers!

It is but a step to the realm of morals or social ethics. Here, we are so occupied with emphasizing equality of the sexes (with supremacy of *the* sex) with eugenics, New Thought, Freudism and every pyscho-ethical fad, that old-time morality is in danger of being listed in the teasing gnat tables. The importance of auras has outclassed haloes!

And if we may tread on the delicate—or we had almost said the indelicate—ground of the clothing we wear, we must admit that Carlyle has not said the last word on the ethics and aesthetics of clothes.. The Scotch sage did not know the habits—in either sense—of this present century. Could he undergo the reincarnation so glibly talked of in ladies' clubs, and elsewhere, might he not give us a most interesting sequel-volume on Sartor Resartus?—unless the canny Jenny Welsh Carlyle headed him off? "Clothed, and in his right mind." These were concomitants with the Gadarene. *"Mens sana in corpore sano, vestituto sane,"* the old phrase might well be extended. Dignity, serenity, restraint of garb are scarcely preserved for us elsewhere than in the cloister. Even those who might have been inclined to plead for a little more laxity in the clerical collar, or a little more leniency in the Sister's wimple, might well be deterred by the "decline and fall off" of good manners in dress, so painfully evident elsewhere. Surely, the fair vesture of the saints must be wrought out on earth by restrained and well-ordered lives.

If we turn to the department of education, shall we not find more hopeful signs? Is it not true that, in the past, much mental rubbish, or at best mere scaffolding for the building of life, has been stressed at the expense of efficiency? Perhaps we must be forced to allow something on that side of the balance. But it may be as well to pause and ask, "Efficiency for what?" Is it to be just for one's "job?" Is it to make one an exact peg for the hole he is to fill? Pegs are useful, but not inspiring. The electrified core of a magnet is efficient too; but currents of potentially permanent forces flow through it. If we are to stress

the practical at the expense of the ideal, the pragmatic values at the expense of the humanities, are we not in a way to lose an impetus which makes the practical tolerable? The study of Jitsu, or of sewage, may make for efficiency in some of our youth, but if we do not find them time for any contact with cultural subjects, are we not so limiting the point of perspective that a gnat may very well look as large as a camel?

Possibly it is perfectly right to teach history chiefly in relation to industry. It may even be advantageous to begin our study at the present era and crawfish backward, if we really desire to know what our ancestors owe to *us!* If we actually want our children Montessoried, or Gary-fied, or brought into line—the line of a tee-to-tum—with new systems which have no curricula at all, and are quite minus discipline or authority (obsolete words, which in ten years we may not be able to find in the dictionary) we may pay our money and take our choice, with perhaps no harm done.

But when it comes to the matter of education in our own Church schools, does it not behoove our Church people to pause? Surely, here the matter of values is of extreme and vital importance. Instruction in the Faith should not only be in the catalogue, but definitely in the curriculum and in the atmosphere. It will not do to stress "good form" and "playing the game" while leaving out of calculation the factors of prayer, faith, self-discipline and sacramental grace. It is the old story of the attempt to pull oneself up by the boot-straps. It is confounding, in a very sad way, gnats with camels.

That there are schools where no such mistake is possible is, of course, beyond question.

But there may be far more disastrous confusions than those spoken of. Even in the preaching and the teaching which is sometimes put forth, in the name of the Church Catholic, from our pulpits or our press is there not a danger of false valuations —a peril of sanitation and hygiene being stressed at the expense of the Gospel and the sacraments? We are compelled to doubt whether, in many cases, the ministry to the body (with perhaps a corollary for the soul) be not given supreme attention. Far be it from any of us to belittle the corporal works of mercy, or to deprecate the suggestion of that wholesome mindedness which is healthfulness! But surely the emphasis is often wrong,

the values are misplaced. The ugly camels of sin are swallowed while we are engaged in straining out civic gnats—pests, to be sure, but not so bad as the foul marsh which breeds them!

Further, while we are fussing with our neighbor's betterment or uplift, is not our own interior life often sagging very low? It is easier to be active than to be meditative, to be a "good organizer" than a good worshipper. True, we cannot be saved alone—nor do we want to be. But it is also true that our efforts cannot raise our neighbor much higher than our own level—which sometimes seems to stop at the plane of social service.

Happily, the Church has moved far since it used to strain candles, and swallow the dismissal of nine-tenths of the congregation at the Prayer for the Church Militant, since it used to find wafers obnoxious and non-communicating attendance abhorrent. But is there not still much to be desired in the Point of Perspective? The emphasis on high Matins, and the light stressing of Eucharists is still too prevalent. Penance is too often spoken of in a derogatory or gossiping whisper. The sacrament of Holy Unction is too often ignored or misapplied. And in our confounding of union of the churches with the unity of the Body we are surely not yet free of our zoo-entomological confusion.

But there are signs of better things within our American-Catholic communion. There is a point of perspective which many are reaching after, and many have attained. Is it not the compelling vision that the things most worth while are those which bring us into closest, most vital union with our heavenly Lord, and so with all His earthly members?

Rest Denied

TAVISH HOGGE

"YES," said the quiet voice, "it was absolutely contrary to all preconceived opinion, but it happened nevertheless."

As I glanced at the calm steady face of the speaker I knew that, however strange the tale, it would be true to fact.

"Tell me the whole story," I demanded, "from the beginning to the very end."

I had known Gordon for years. He was the kind of fellow on

whom one could always rely, quiet, steady, and almost without nerves. When other people got excited and made themselves somewhat ridiculous Gordon would only grow quieter and more watchful, yet somehow one felt as though he were keenly alive to all that was going on in each individual mind, and was almost, as it were, holding silent intercourse with each one present. He was one of the most curious characters I have ever met. He had all the intuition and sympathy of a woman and, at the same time, was absolutely dauntless and the reverse of anything approaching effeminacy. It was so seldom that he ever gave any personal experiences that I privately hugged myself in delighted anticipation.

"Fire away, old chap," I said again, as I settled myself comfortably into my deep, well-cushioned lounge and watched him light his pipe as he stood leaning against the fireplace. "Take your time, but give us every word of it."

He made an interesting picture as the firelight played on the quiet face. He had come to visit me in my own home in Somerset, and we had not met for years. He had entered the priesthood, whilst I had been with my regiment in India. Now we met after many years and each quietly took stock of the other, noting the changes wrought by time and varying experiences. Gordon had been staying in Yorkshire with some old college friends, and had evidently been exploring the neighborhood very thoroughly.

"Well, it happened this way," he said. "You know how Cromwell marched through Yorkshire and left his usual traces behind him. I had often heard of ——— Church, but it was some distance off, and it had never been convenient to make the expedition there. However, as I was leaving in a few days' time, I determined to find my way there alone. The church was particularly interesting, from an archeological and historical point of view, and I did not wish to miss what might be my last chance of seeing it.

"I set out in the morning. It was some distance off and I wanted to get there before the heat of the day. My plan was to rest awhile in the church, think out the different points of my sermon for next Sunday, and then explore the church thoroughly. Of course I planned lunch, too, a real country lunch in the village inn; and a country lunch in Yorkshire is something to remember!

"I got to the church after a long ride, only to find it locked. However, the vicarage was nearby, so I went there at once, in order to ask for the key. The vicar was away, but his wife gave me the key of a small door opening directly into the chancel.

"I closed the door after me, wandered casually round the interior in order to somewhat familiarize myself with my surroundings, before settling down to an hour's quiet thought and prayer."

Here he paused; in fact he seemed to be thinking deeply, and I felt instinctively that something was troubling his mind, and was still unsolved. Knowing his peculiar temperament, with its deep reserve and sensitiveness, I waited patiently, fearing lest an ill-timed question might make him draw back into his shell, in which case nothing ever would make him refer to the subject again.

Presently he began again. "I can't explain it," he said; "even now I don't know what made me do it, but I did a thing I had never done before, nor have I done it since. Somehow as I knelt down I prayed, as of course one always does, for all who worshipped in that house of prayer; but then, quite unintentionally and without knowing *why* I did it, I poured out my heart in prayer for all who might be defying GOD in that place, for any who refused to worship. My prayer was most intense, almost painful in its earnestness, though utterly unpremeditated and without conscious reason.

"Scarcely had my prayer been offered, when I was clearly conscious of another presence close to me. Someone was close behind watching my every movement, studying every act."

Again he paused, but this time only for a moment. Turning to me with a half laugh, he continued: "You know how curiously one's mind argues and contradicts itself at times, especially when it is faced unexpectedly with an unwelcome thought. I had scarcely become conscious of the presence near me and the persistent watching than my mind took up a position of rebellious incredulity. For a long time I stubbornly refused to look round, realizing that no one could possibly have entered the church without my knowledge.

"At last, however, no longer able to ignore what was so insistent, and feeling indignant at the ill-mannered intrusion into

my privacy, I stood up and faced round to utter an indignant protest, only to find no one there. The inner knowledge which passes far beyond sense perception told me that I was *not* alone and I began to turn over in my mind any other possible entrances into the church besides the one by which I had entered. I even went so far as to go and test the great western door, only to find it not only locked with a mighty key, but barred with a heavy oaken beam.

"Then I began to be irritated with myself. The church was obviously empty, and here was I wasting my time and failing to concentrate my thought on my sermon. I felt ashamed of myself, but somewhat puzzled and irritated too. Anyway, I gave myself a good scolding, called myself all the most scathing names imaginable and determined to begin again and concentrate more thoroughly. All the same, that unaccountable sense of being closely watched remained, but I determined to ignore it. That was the point of victory, though I did not know it at the time." His eyes glowed. They seemed twice their former size and were curiously luminous, yet with a quiet, steady look in them. My own interest grew with the narrative and I could scarcely take my eyes off his face, though again I shrank from breaking in on his chain of thought.

Presently he went on: "How wonderful is the way in which we are unconsciously tried and tested. In conquering distraction and concentrating on the matter in hand I won a greater triumph than I then knew, for almost immediately relief came, the scrutiny was relaxed and the presence removed, but it did not simply dissolve; it passed up the north aisle into the large vestry, where through the open door I could see the choir surplices hanging round the walls.

"In spite of myself, the relief was immense, although I was still obstinately refusing to acknowledge that there had been anything amiss. My mind worked actively, and the outline of my sermon grew as thought followed thought in rapid succession. It was pure intellectual enjoyment. But suddenly my heart gave a leap. I had been gazing straight in front of me at the altar, eagerly working out the sequence of my subject, when a movement in the choir vestry of which I have already spoken suddenly pulled me up with a jerk and my attention became riveted on the open vestry door. I cannot explain it to you, but I was suddenly

painfully alert and conscious that someone was moving about in the vestry.

"Then for the first time the thought of what we call the supernatural forced itself on me. The thought forced itself, I say—I fought it with all my might. No longer could I meditate over my sermon. Instead my whole mind was in revolt. It was a sacred building, the house of GOD! It was the trysting place between earth and heaven, and once a month at least was the All-Sufficient Sacrifice offered on the altar. No, it was quite impossible that an unholy presence should haunt that place, the very thought seemed a sacrilege. Thus was I arguing with myself when again, with a shock, came another sense of movement in the vestry, and I knew that my arguments were vain, and that something beyond my ken was being forced on my consciousness. That conviction brought a certain calm, but it also roused all the obstinacy of my nature. I keenly resented what I could no longer deny. Undoubtedly some unlawful presence possessed that church and sought to drive forth those who came to taste somewhat of the peace of communion with GOD.

"I need scarcely say that all thought of my sermon vanished from my mind, but I would not be hurried nor forced to retire. Stubbornly I remained, watchful and alert, but deeply defiant, until an hour had passed.

"Then I determined to do what I had come to do, *i.e.,* thoroughly explore the church, although now with a totally different interest. I decided to ignore the unwelcome presence, and in a designedly leisurely manner I examined the entire building, not even omitting the choir vestry.

"While I was doing this the chancel door opened and in came the vicar's wife, anxious no doubt about the key and wondering why my visit had lasted so long. Quick as lightning I decided to test the truth of my experiences without betraying my suspicions.

"Mrs. ——— was a charming woman, although by no means young. She offered to take me around the church herself in case some of its beauties had escaped my notice. Nothing could have pleased me better. We investigated everything, and little by little I steered her up the north aisle until we stood just outside the fateful vestry.

"Here I determined to put my questions, albeit I was anxious not to betray myself unwittingly. Having mentioned with great appreciation some of the interesting objects she had been pointing out to me, I remarked in a casual manner, 'Yes, there is an *unusual* interest about this church.' Watching her carefully as I weighed my words, I saw a swift look of veiled inquiry come into her eyes. Slowly and deliberately I continued, 'There is something quite peculiar about it.'

"Scarcely were the words out of my mouth when, involuntarily, she turned her head with a slinking furtive motion and glanced uneasily over her shoulder into the choir vestry! Of course that movement and her uneasy look were sufficient, and I knew immediately all I had guessed before. Taking the bull by the horns then, I laughed and nodded, saying, 'Yes, he is in there!' 'Oh,' she cried, 'have you seen him?' 'No, I have not seen him, but he has been annoying me the whole time and he did his level best to drive me out. Perhaps you can tell me something about him.'

" 'No,' she said, 'we can't find out who it is nor why he is here. There are two graves in the floor of the vestry, as you see, and we have had them both opened, but there was nothing unusual, nothing to account for this horrible thing.'

"Briefly she went on to tell me their own experiences. They could never keep an organist, for the organ seat was always shared by the unseen tenant, and the close scrutinizing proximity was too unbearable. Her daughter, she went on, had charge of the flowers on the altar, but nothing would induce her to do the vases in the church. She dashed in, took the vases out into the churchyard, and preferred to arrange them on one of the tombs out-of-doors.

"However, the various incidents would only weary you. There is only one thing more, though, that I must mention. In order to leave the church we had to pass through the chancel, where the door was by which we had entered. As we did so some strong personal antagonism, which I can only call a blast of hatred, came from the choir vestry. It was appalling! Mrs. S——— fled out in haste, but I was angered and filled with righteous indignation. I stood and faced the vestry in defiance, and it was the clash of two spirits, the embodied and the disembodied, in dire conflict. There was nothing brave about it," he

said, turning in answer to a stifled exclamation. "Some instinct told me that he could not approach to where I stood in the more sacred part of the edifice, and there indeed it was a case of 'spirit with spirit can meet' not in love but in warfare." He stopped, lost in thought.

"But Gordon," I said, "that surely is not all. What is your own explanation of it? How do you account for it all? Have you no theory, no possible explanation of the mystery?"

"Yes, of course I have," he answered, "and curiously enough I feel perfectly certain I am right. Like my conceit, isn't it, old boy?" He broke off with a laugh. "That church was one of those desecrated by Cromwell. It was used as a stable for his horses, in spite of the Blessed Sacrament resting in the Tabernacle. The haunting presence was intensely malignant and cruel, just such a personality as doubtless many of Cromwell's soldiers possessed. In all probability some dastardly act of cruelty and sacrilege was committed in the church and has never been expiated. Nowadays we like to forget that reparation and expiation are due for sin, and how many of us take home the Church's lesson as she pleads for the faithful departed that 'they may *rest* in peace!' The prayer is offered for 'the faithful' for one thing and the Church certainly does not consider 'rest in peace' to follow as a matter of course, else she would not teach us to pray so earnestly for it.

"That soul is still impenitent," he went on. "It is the penitent only who can find rest in our Lord, as they let His hand cleanse and purge them more and more, until, like silver, they reflect His likeness perfectly."

BOOK REVIEWS

The Crisis of the Churches. By Leighton Parks, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922; pp. xxiv+256. $2.50.

This is not a very cheerful book, but that is not Dr. Parks' fault,—we do not live in very cheerful times. Dr. Parks analyzes the present state of the world and comes to the same conclusion which many thinkers and students of history seem rapidly to be reaching, that we are approaching a crisis in the history of the world in which the fall of the present civilization is imminent. We are perhaps tempted to overstress the symp-

toms of social failure through reaction from the silly optimism that was poured over us in noisome floods in the early stages of the late war; Dr. Parks' Protestant friends, in particular, were quite sure that the millenium had dawned. However, the situation is threatening enough: the question is, what are we going to do? If I understand him, Dr. Parks looks to the Protestant churches, or the best element in them, to rescue us, if rescue still be possible. This is rather extraordinary; for to a good many of us the decadence of the present civilization is more marked in Protestantism than elsewhere. Those items in the indictment of the modern world which are most convincing are largely due to the failure of Protestantism. Would the divorce evil, of which Dr. Parks makes so much, have been possible if it had not had the connivance, not to say the support, of Protestantism? And where has the spurious patriotism which Dr. Parks deprecates been more strikingly displayed these last years than in the Protestant pulpit?

Dr. Parks places his hope in a united action of certain elements in the Protestant churches. He throws aside all the present proposals for church unity as wholly impractical so long as the churches of the Anglican tradition insist on the necessity of orders. The necessity of orders is to the author merely an outworn superstition. As Dr. Parks apparently expects no help from the various parts of the Church that hold to the Catholic religion, as he seems to have no illusions as to the present competency of Protestantism as organized, he turns with hope to some sort of an invisible church of Protestants as the trustees of the hope of the future of the world. "If church unity is an impossibility as at present conceived, and yet it is evident that without some closer association the churches are impotent, what remains? I answer: Fellowship. Whether there can be such an association of the churches as would reveal a complete manifestation of the indwelling spirit of God, which is really the desire of many earnest men, we need not now consider. * * * This, however, will, I believe, be acknowledged by all reasonable men, that such an association must be preceded by a spiritual unity, which is what we mean by fellowship. 'What is the one church?' The one church is the brotherhood. It is not to be identified exclusively with this church or that one; it is the 'blessed company of all faithful people.' This, one would think, should be a truism. But, as a matter of fact, it is a truth that has long been ignored. But were it recognized, it would seem that the problem before the churches today is not at all what it has been assumed to be, viz.: 'How shall we attain church unity?' The real problem is: 'How is the spiritual unity of the brotherhood, which already exists, to be made more effective in the life of the world?'"

But how is this fellowship to be made effective? How are we to get at a common understanding and working programme? Dr. Parks' method has at least the value of novelty. I will quote him at some length:

> I am convinced that a vital unity of Christians cannot be obtained by ignoring the past. I believe that what is now needed is a fair statement of the position of each of the churches, so that there will be a better understanding of the reason, not alone for the original separation, but also for the continuance of each. It is because of this that I shall venture, even at the risk of being thought sectarian, to point out why, in my opinion, the Episcopal Church is not justified in allowing itself to be absorbed in a general American Church, which might fail to safeguard those things without which I fear the larger church might lose much that is of permanent value. But the same is true of all the churches. Not by ignoring our differences, but by emphasising our principles, shall we be in a position to know what is of permanent and what of merely temporary value.
>
> "I would suggest then that, paradoxical as it may seem, the first step toward more effective association will be found, not in ignoring the differences of the churches, but, on the contrary, in glorifying them. * * * Suppose each of the churches were to set forth in popular form the reasons that lead its members to think that their church was not only justified in separating from some other group in the past, but is also justified in continuing to bear witness to that aspect of truth which seems to them valuable for the whole body of Christ, it might be that there would result such a mutual understanding and respect for one another as would enable each church to learn from every other, and so prepare the way for some more effective association of the various churches than is now possible. Too long has the 'hand' said to the 'foot': 'Because you are not the hand you are not of the body.' Let us now see what each member has to say for itself, and what it believes to be its value not to itself alone, but to the whole body of Christ. (106-7).

And there are those who have thought of Dr. Parks as a rather hard-headed man of the world, and now—"Behold, this dreamer cometh"!

A large part of Dr. Parks' book is taken up with a discussion of what he understands to be the meaning of the Episcopal Church. We have a discussion of the ministry showing that there is no such thing as an authoritative ministry. There is discussion of the creeds and a long justification of saying them in church when you do not believe them in private. There is a discussion of the sacraments—or of some of them—dismissing the theory of all the Catholic centuries as "magic" and implicitly classing all the Catholic saints and doctors as "magicians." Dr. Parks tries valiantly to be fair and charitable, but it is easy to see that "Anglo-Catholics" get on his nerves. Let us hear what he has to say of us:

> There is another aspect of sacramentarianism to which it is painful to call attention, and yet, without doing so, its danger cannot be appreciated. The

> Protestant would gladly admit that the devout Catholic, in assisting at the mass, does enter into mystic communion with God, not because his theory of magic brings God to him, but because God is seeking him as Jesus sought for the Samaritans who worshipped on Mount Gerizim. Nor would the Protestant deny the evident fact that devout men and women in the Anglican communion whose custom it is to participate frequently in the Lord's Supper receive a spiritual benefit, even though their thought as to the way in which the blessing comes is confused. Self-examination, confession of failure, prayer for pardon, and the remembrance of Christ's presence lead to peace of mind and renewed spiritual life. But, on the other hand, is not the Protestant right in saying that sacramental religion, with it 'confession and absolution, fasting, the Real Presence, the devotion of the Three Hours, the use of incense, etc.,' is essentially a mechanical religion, and is deadening to the conscience unless that be quickened by communion with God which has no necessary connection with these mechanical acts? While it is true that no church nor school of thought in any church is altogether free from unworthy members, has not sacramental religion more such than any other form of Christian religion; or, at least, are not the unworthy members in that more conspicuous, and, consequently, their lives more scandalous? The fact is too well known to require illustration by particular instances that in the Roman Catholic Church and in the Anglican communion there is a disproportionately large number of worldly men and women who are scrupulous in mechanical devotion, but worldly in life. (224-5.)

Let us leave it at that, and smite upon our breasts and say: "God be merciful to me, a sinner."

In the early part of the nineteenth century there was in Connecticut an old priest of some note for his sense of humor. Meeting a Protestant minister one day they fell into conversation, in the course of which the minister gave utterance to the commonly accepted theory of the Episcopal Church. "There is not much religion, I suppose," he remarked, "in the Episcopal Church." Said the old priest: "None to brag of, none to brag of." J. G. H. B.

Painted Windows. By a Gentleman With a Duster. New York and London: Putnam's, 1922; pp. xvii+299. $2.50.

This is an American edition of a work which has aroused considerable interest in England. It will be remembered by some that this is another pronouncement by the "Gentleman With a Duster," who wrote *"The Mirrors of Downing Street"* and *"The Glass of Fashion."* In this most recent volume he has devoted himself exclusively to ecclesiastical interiors and has given us interesting and intimate studies of some of the more prominent ecclesiastical leaders of England. They are not all selected from the Church of England. It is probable that an American counterpart of

this work will be brought out before long, just as *"The Mirrors of Washington"* was an American counterpart of *"The Mirrors of Downing Street."*

We in America are somewhat behind England in frank and outspoken criticism of the clergy. It would hardly be possible for an American writer to write so intimately and unsparingly of the lives of living representatives of the various American religious bodies as has been done by Mr. Harold Begbie in this volume. It is no longer a secret that he is the author. If we are so remiss in comparison with our English friends in this respect, does it mean indifference? Does it mean that we care so little about our clergy and other spiritual leaders that we are conscious neither of their faults nor of their virtues? And should such frank criticism of the clergy be encouraged?

These are interesting questions and not altogether easy to answer. In attempting to answer the last one it would be necessary for us to make a distinction between the wrong kind of criticism and the right kind. Certainly petty fault finding and invidious gossip directed against those who are in positions of authority in our various religious groups are not desirable. Criticism of this kind cannot but bring the office which the man holds and the Church behind him into serious disrepute with the laity. Real criticism is quite another matter,—that is always valuable. We cannot have too many books which will tell what manner of men in spirit and in intellect our religious leaders are. We like to know of any outstanding character of this sort, what is his message to the people of his time, what are his habits of life and work, what are his opinions on the vital issues of the day. Let us hope that if an American book of this kind is written it will contain only criticism of the latter sort and will not be a sort of ecclesiastical "Town Topics."

"Painted Windows" contains in the main the better kind of criticism. Mr. Begbie's personal sympathies and antipathies, however, are frequently obtrusive, and divert our attention from the man he is describing. He is plainly intolerant of everything Catholic, though he is forced to admit the significance of the Catholic element in the thought and the spirituality of such men as Bishop Gore and Bishop Temple. One imagines that Dean Inge would be the perfect embodiment of the writer's ideals, if he were not so hard on Socialism. Is the writer quite a trustworthy chronicler when he says that there are neither gentlemen nor scholars among the younger generation of Anglo-Catholics? That would seem too good to be true. It would put them in the same class with the early Christians of whom St. Paul said "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble" were called.

Common Prayers, with Hymns, Litanies and Other Devotions for Use at Divine Service. London: S. SS. P. & P., 1922; pp. 183. 5/s and 8/6.

Most priests have long been looking for a book of private devotions which would contain the proper prayers to be used in preparation for mass and for thanksgiving after mass, as well as litanies and other forms of devotion for special seasons. There have been various priests' prayer books, but most of us have found them rather impractical, as they contained mostly little prayers to be used on all sorts of occasions, hymns which we never did use and Scripture readings for sundry emergencies which never arose.

This little book of common prayers issued by the Society of SS. Peter and Paul is the richest and most useful collection of such priestly devotions that has ever come to our notice. It is published in two distinct forms, both of which have the same number of pages, but one is printed on thicker paper than the other. The smaller edition is convenient to carry about when traveling or to put in one's pocket.

There are no doubt prayers in this book which would offend certain of the brethren who think that some of us are going too far, but it would be a pity to miss all the other good prayers that are here available because there are a few prayers that one does not like; It would seem wiser to draw a pen through those prayers that one finds objectionable. There are, for example, under litanies, the litanies of the Holy Name of Jesus, of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, of Loretto of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of All Saints, and the Anglican litany from the Book of Common Prayer. Probably some of these litanies would be too shocking for some sober and conservative Churchmen to use. The book contains the beautiful prayers of St. Ambrose for every day in the week in preparation for mass, as well as the familiar prayer of St. Thomas Aquinas and the acts of virtue by St. Francis de Sales, which are extremely helpful in preparation for Holy Communion. We also have found most edifying, to be used in thanksgiving after mass, the prayers of St. Alphonsus Liguori, whereof one is appointed for each day in the week; but no doubt others would not agree with us on this point. In devotions, as in other matters, there is no accounting for tastes.

It is needless to say that these books are published with the perfection of letter press and form which we are accustomed to associate with all the publications of this excellent society. We hope that their books will become increasingly familiar to American churchmen.

Glories of the Love of Jesus. Devotional Studies by the Rev. Jesse Brett, L.Th. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1922; pp. 125. $1.75.

This latest of Father Brett's devotional books is to be commended. It takes us through the life of our Lord, to Heaven and to the Blessed Sacrament, pressing the necessity of love for the Christian. The book requires close attention, but its study will be rewarded, for the author makes each expression tell. He sets as a standard the cultivation of a supreme and consuming love for our Lord; perfectly logical, exclusive and self-sacrificing. As he says, "He willed the perfection of the race through the perfection of individuals." The demand upon the thorough-going Christian is for the attaining of supernatural virtues, as opposed to the virtues of convenience. Of human suffering Father Brett says: "Suffering that is not understood and turned to account in the soul's life obscures the light of divine love, and we have the spectacle of a soul evading sanctity."

The picture set before the reader is exacting, fit to tax the powers of the spirit; but the image of our Lord's love is far from that which would appeal to the weakly sentimental or the unhealthily religious. Many who have no taste for "devotional" reading would be surprised to find how this book would inspire them. P. R. F.

A Short History of the Church of Russia, Its Teaching and Its Worship. By the Rev. Reginald F. Bigg-Wither, M.A. London: S. P. C. K., 1920.

For people,—and it is to be hoped there are many,—who wish to read in short space some account of the Russian Church and its characteristic features, this volume of a hundred pages may be cordially recommended. Part of its usefulness comes from the fact that the writer spent six years in Russia years ago and consequently experienced the atmosphere of the Russian Church when it was on the high wave of prosperity. A measure of its value also comes from the acknowledgment frankly made by the author that he has borrowed and condensed material from the writings of others, experts and specialists in certain phases of Russian Church history. One chapter is given to the Russian Church in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The book is profusely illustrated, giving pictures on ceremonial features which are very helpful to us accustomed to Western vestments and ceremonial. A. W. J.

Bible and Spade. By John P. Peters. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1922; pp. 239. $1.75.

These are the Bross Lectures for 1921. They were delivered at Lake

Forest, Illinois, by Dr. Peters shortly before his death. The subject is one which Dr. Peters was peculiarly well prepared to discuss, for besides having been a trained archaeologist, he was an expert in Old Testament learning. There are five lectures. The first is on the Ancestry of the Hebrews, and here the author is at his best, for he had made a specialty of this period of Old Testament history. There is little to criticize here, although that does not mean that one would accept all that Dr. Peters has to say about the many thorny problems of that particular stage of Hebrew history. This is particularly true in connection with the date of the Exodus, which he places in the earlier part of the reign of Rameses II, without, it seems to the reviewer, sufficient reasonable evidence. Lecture two is on Cosmogony and Folk-lore; lecture three is on History and Prophecy, and lecture four is on Hebrew Psalmody. Here again in this fourth lecture Dr. Peters writes as an expert, and also with sound judgment and real spiritual insight. He rightly complains of the way in which the Psalms have been mishandled by such men as Kent, Briggs, and Cheyne, especially the last. Lecture five is perhaps the most popular, being a brief résumé and an interesting account of exploration in Palestine. The last lecture is on New Testament times, but falls short of the standard set in the earlier lectures. The book is well illustrated, and the proofreading was fairly well done (substitute Constantinople for Jerusalem, p. 175, l. 20), but in spite of the good Summary of Contents there should have been an Index. There is little that is particularly new to be found in this book, but because of the freshness of treatment, and because of the author's personal acquaintance with the Bible home-land, it is well worth the low price at which it is published.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

BOOKS RECEIVED

A Little Princess (An Allegory on the Eucharist for Children). By A. M. Tennant. London: Mowbray, 1920; pp. 101. Price, 7 shillings, net.

The Coming of the Lord. Meditations on Advent and kindred topics. By B. W. Randolph, D.D. Milwaukee and London: Mowbray, 1920; pp. 84. $1.05.

Property—Its Rights and Duties. By various writers (introduction by Bishop Gore). New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xxiv+243. $2.00.

Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality (Gifford Lectures). By Lewis Richard Farnell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921; pp. ix+434.

Towards the Great Peace. By Ralph Adams Cram. Boston: Marshall Jones, 1922; pp. vi+263. $2.50.

The Book of Missionary Heroes. By Basil Matthews. New York: Doran, 1922; pp. vii+280. $1.50.

Monasticism and Civilization. By John B. O'Connor, O.P., P.G. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1921; pp. ix+253. $1.75.

A Faith That Enquires. The Gifford Lectures for 1920-1921. By Sir Henry Jones. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. x+278. $2.00.

A Student's Philosophy of Religion. By William Kelly Wright, Ph.D. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xii+472. $3.75.

The Creative Christ. By Edward S. Drown. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. 167. $1.25.

The Communion of the Body of Christ. By J. N. Newland-Smith, M.A. Milwaukee and London: Mowbray, 1921; pp. vi+46. 70 cents.

The Universal Church. By T. A. Lacey. Milwaukee and London: Mowbray, 1921; pp. 53.

A Child's Religion. By E. Sanders. London: Mowbray, 1920; pp. 97. 90 cents.

The Creed and Need of the New Congregationalism. By Franklin M. Sprague. Tampa, Fla.: Copyright by the author, 1920; pp. xxvi+137. $1.50.

The Crisis of the Churches. By Leighton Parks, D.D., New York: Scribner's, 1922; pp. xxiv+256. $2.50.

The Book of Job. By Moses Buttenwieser. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xix+370. $4.00.

Painted Windows. By A Gentleman With a Duster. New York and London: Putnam's, 1922; pp. xvii+229. $2.50.

Creative Christianity. By Professor George Cross. New York: Macmillan, 1922; pp. xii+164. $1.50.